

Full and Final ANSWER
TO A
TRIFFLING REPLY made unto a Paper;
ENTITLED
PLAIN-DEALING
WITH THE
PRESBYTERIANS
WHEREIN THE
Reasonableness and necessity of a Toleration is maintained,
AGAINST
*All that is said in the Gentleman's Letter to a Member
of Parliament, and Vindication thereof.*

In a Letter to a Friend.

Isaiah, 54. 17.

No weapon, that is formed against thee, shall prosper; and every Tongue, that shall rise up against Thee in Judgement, Thou shalt Condemn. This is the Heritage of the Servants of the LORD, and their Righteousness is of ME, saith the LORD.

2. Timothy 3. 13.

But Evil Men and Seducers shall wax worse and worse; deceiving, and being deceived.

Joann Calvin. Comment. in Epist. Paul. ad Titum, ad versum quintum, Capitis primi. Discimus quidem ex hoc loco, non eam fuisse tunc aequalitatem inter Ecclesie Ministros, quin unus aliquis autoritate et consilio praesset; nihil tamen hoc ad tyrannicum et profanum Collationum morem, qui in papatu regnat. Longe enim diversa fuit Apostolorum ratio.

Printed in the Year M. DCC. III.

TO A
ARRIVING AT THE
ENTITLED
PLAIN-DEALING
WITH THE
PRESBYTERIANS

WHEREIN THE



In order to a Friend.

Printed in the Year M DCC. XL.

Sir,

YOU may Remember, that in a Paper Entituled *Plain Dealing, &c.* I gave a *Formal and Direct Answer* to every Paragraph in the *Gentleman's Letter*, concerning a *Toleration*, being mov'd thereunto by your Commands, and our common Concern, rather than by any great Opinion I had of his *Performance*. Agreeably to the *Title* of my *Answer*, I dealt both plainly and fairly with him, following him punctually Word for Word thorow out the whole *Letter*, neither misrepresenting the Sense of his Words, nor proposing his Arguments with Disadvantage, nor passing over any one Argument without Answering it, except his *Calumnies* and *Impertinences*. He that keeps close to his Adversary, declines no Difficulty, uses no Reproachful Language, or disingenuous Dealing, hath certainly greater Assurance of the Truth and Goodness of his Cause, and more hopes to prevail, than he that studies for Shifts and Evasions, leaves out and avoids the strongest Arguments, and flies out to Impertinent Cavils and Personal Reflections; which are great Signs that the Man is conscious of the Badness of his Cause, and despairs of Success by any other Means. I expected my Adversary in his *Reply*, should have observed the same Measures with me; but fair and Ingenuous Dealing is not his Way. To avoid the Disreputation of losing his Ground, he has often overlooked my hardest Arguments, as shall be made appear, and filled his Pages with *Disingenuous Misrepresentations*, *Impertinent Digressions*, *Illogical Inferences*, *Nauseous Repetitions*, *confident Assertions*, *Impudent Denials*, *Ridiculous and false Stories*, *Rude and Unbecoming Reproaches*, *Malicious Calumnies* and bitter *Invectives*; Treating me all along in his Scurrilous *Reply*, as if I were some Silly Creature, scarce Master of Common Sense, speaking often against my own Design and Interest.

This *Vindicator* seems to have imitated the Poet *Martial*, who, rather than his Book should perish, by Reason of its small Bulk, resolved to fill up as many Pages, as *Homer* ceked Verses, with that Catholick Patch,

*Ergo ne pereat brevibus mihi Charta Libellis,
Datur potius To. & antiquo, &c.*

Just so, he has chosen to make up his *Reply* of vain *Tautologies* and other fustian Stuff, rather than that it should not appear bulky, in the Eyes of the weak and Credulous among his Adherents, who are accustomed to judge of this, or any other Discourse about Matters of Religion, more by the Quantity and Length, than the Quality and Strength of what is said or written.

ten. And tho he gives no Tolerable Reply to any Charge advanced against him in the *Plain Dealing*, yet after whiffing and Triffling a while; The vain Man Triumphs and cries Victory, concluding his Paragraphs with these words, *Thus the first, the second, the third, &c. Argument in the Letter against Toleration, stands firm and steadfast.* This is the Burden of the Song, whatever be the Premises; this is the Conclusion to which he is fatally determined. Just like unto the Fox in the *Fable*, who learning to spell, whatever the Word or Syllables of it were, yet at joining them together, he still pronounced *Agnus*, i. e. a Lamb: Or, as it is storied of the *Old Priest* at *Elgin*, who in his Grace after Meat always used these words, *Pro his donis, que jam mumpsimus, agimus tibi Gratiar, &c.* Whereupon a young Friar told him, he should abstain from that Barbarous Word, and say, *Sumpsimus*; But the Old Father reply'd in Choler, *Let alone; I will not quire my old Mumpsimus for your new Sumpsimus.* Just so, this Man obstinately sticks to the Conclusion, *No Toleration*; notwithstanding all the Convincing Arguments to the contrary, which he neither medles with, nor is able to Answer.

And now, that his Reply to the *Plain Dealing*, may appear to the Reader such, as it is above represented, I shall apply my self to the Examination of his weak, unsatisfying and superficial Answers made thereunto; and while, I so do, I shall offer nothing but what is just and true, and with which my own Mind is well satisfied.

The Pamphlet upon which I am now to write my Animadversions, is entituled by its Author, *Toleration's Fence Removed; The Thoughts, &c. Considered and Exposed: Plain Dealing with the Presbyterians*, as it is not to be found, so not to be expected from Prelatical Pamphleteers. These three are Printed and Scitched together, and it is only the last I am concerned to Refute.

I begin then at the 14th page, where he makes the first Attack on me, where I meet with two disdainfull strokes of his Pen, the one is; *That he had read over the Plain-Dealing, and believes there is not one new Argument in it all, yea nothing but what has been answered again and again:* What doth it Matter what he believes? will his unbelief make it so? sure I am, there are many Men of fully as clear Judgement as this *Vindicator*, who having compared it with the earlier Papers, know and acknowledge there are divers new thoughts and particulars in it, not formerly mentioned by others; whereof I'll try to make himself sensible before I have done.

And that these things have been answered again and again, if he means fully and to purpose, it is more than I yet know; all that hath hitherto been said, will not serve his Turn, they not being solid, satisfactory, and to the Point; but meer Juggle and Tergiversation, a running away from the

the Argument, and begging the Question. If these things had been well answered, I might have received some Tolerable Reply, which I mightily desiderat. The other is, that he calls my Paper, *Old borrowed thoughts in a new Dress*; This is a Swatch of his *Modesty* and *Good Manners*: And what if I should tell him, that he might say of his Letter, as the Young Prophet did of the Ax, *2 Kings 6. 5. Alas, Master, it was borrowed!* would he think this Reconcilable to the Rules of Civility? And yet some may be apt to think, when they consider his pitiful Defence of it, that either he has been beholding to another, or then it has been his last Effort of Nature, on which he has bestowed all the Ammunition of his Wit, and Reasoning Faculty; and now, being destitute of other *Artillery*, throws about him Dirt and Stones.

I arrogate to my self no Man's Performances, I meddle only with what is truly *mine*. If there occur in my Paper many things, that upon the Matter have been said before, it is nothing strange, since the Subject is very common, and now for some Moneths hath exercised the Pens of many Writers, and Truth is still the same, and indivisible.

I can prove by more than half a dozen of Witnesses of Unstain'd Reputation, that these Sheets of mine were ready for the Press, more than a Moneth before they were exposed; and why I did respire the publishing of them, I am not bound to account to him.

As for his Remarks upon the *Case &c.* they are unworthy of the Authors Regard, or any Man's else, the *Impudence* and *Ignorance* of the Writer, is sufficiently exposed in the Discourse called, *Imparity among Pastors, &c.*

But who is it, I pray, Sir, that hath the Knack of Saying and unsaying of affirming and denying the very same thing in a few pages, nay in the very next Lines? he says, *ibid. I had not been at leisure to take notice of what was contained in these Papers*, he means *Remarks* and *second Letter*. And in the very next Sentence, he saith, *that I finding what was contained in them to be too hard for me, set my Thumb upon it*. Here is a downright Contradiction, *I had not been at leisure to notice these things*; and yet again, *I did notice and suppress them*. And page 16, Line 13. *I cunningly carried as if I had taken no Notice*. This Man is not consistent with himself, *conveniet nulli, &c.*

Again *ibid.* He bespatters me as a Man of bad Disposition, in charging *Presbyterians* with *Malice*, and telling a long Train of Stories and mischievous Inventions to the Members of Parliament, and asks, *how come I to know this?* I answer perfectly well; for Our Blessed Saviour hath said, by

*their fruits you shall know them ; And we have deeply tasted of their wild and sowre Grapes, since the late Revolution. Are not their own Rancorous and Railing Pamphlets written since the downfiting of Parliament, sufficient Informers? Doth not his own Letter, which (he brags page 3.) was the first Paper that appeared in the Field against Toleration, declare it to all that look on it? Let any Man read but the two last Leaves of it, and then Judge whether more malicious and mischievous Stories can be told against us? And 'tis well known they went about in Bands from Member to Member of that Honourable House, presenting them with Copies of it; And is it credible they would speak better things of Us in secret, than they exposed to the view of the World? Since then he asks me, how come I to know it? I'll gratify him for once to tell him, himself is one of my Informers, and his *Threesfold-Cordman* is another. And tho in page 15. Our *Vindicator* declines to justify that Man in every thing there, yet they are Birds of a Feather, Advocats both for the *Good Old Cause*, and never a *Barrel the better Herring*.*

His next Velitation, before he comes to the point, is page 15, where he denies that the Presbyterians sought a *Toleration* in *King James the Seventh's* Time; But was there no pleading for *Toleration* or *Indulgence* in the Reign of *King Charles the 2d.*? will he as peremptorily refuse this too? However it was, he acknowledges they accepted *King James* his *Toleration*, gave thanks for it, Met at *Edinburgh*, and concerted *Overtures* to make it practicable throughout the Country, and, saith he, *they might be reckoned mad Men had they done otherwise*; and this is sufficient for my Purpose, for, if it was Lawful for them to accept it, even tho it was a favour designed for *Papists*, as he owns there, than it was Lawful also for them to seek it, for no good Man should Embrace or ask an unlawful thing; and by consequence, it is Lawful for the *Prelatists* to Crave, And pious and Charitable for the *Queen* and *Parliament* to grant a *Toleration* to them at this time. The Argument concludes more strongly on our side than theirs. For he confesseth there that *Toleration* was a favour meerly designed for *Papists*, and since indeed it was so, then there was the greater Reason to Refuse it, and necessary for uniting with their Brethren of the then Established Church, to oppose the common and known Enemies of our Holy Religion, which in the Eyes of the Nation was then in great hazard; than to contribute to the design of introducing *Papery* by such an acceptation. And it's very fine, what he saith, the Freedom to *Papists* made their Preaching

more

more necessary; As if, forsooth, the Church then had needed their assistance that way, or the Presbyterians had then Preached against the errors of *Rome*, or the danger of their spreading and prevailing in the Land: No, not one word about this, they were Wiser than to offend their Friends, by whose help they hoped to pull down the *Episcopal Church*; for they can join with them for such an end, tho not in their Idolatries, &c.

In the next place, *ibid.* This *Vindicator* grows a little nimble, and labours to turn my Cannon against my self, but he is not yet Master of my Artillery. I affirmed (in *Plain Dealing*, page 3. near the end, and page 4.) That to separate from a duly constitute Church (as theirs never was,) Govern'd by Lawful Canonical Bishops and Presbyters, and where nothing unlawful is required as a Condition of Communion with it, is to be guilty of Schism; But such was our *Episcopal Church*, from which the Presbyterians Factiously and Furiously separated: Therefore the Presbyterians, in separating from our Church, were *Schismatics*. My Reasonings there are not put into the Form of a Syllogism, (as this Academick Author doth his) but they amount to fully as much as in the Order they now are.

The *Vindicator* agrees here to my *Major Proposition*, as being a true definition of *Schism*. As for the *Minor*, I proved it to a Demonstration in the fore-cited pages of *Plain Dealing*; as to both its Parts; That they separated cannot denyed; That our Church was duly constitute, and required nothing unlawful as a Condition of Communion with it, is equally true with the former, for our Author in this *Letter* page 3. Acknowledges, That *their Doctrine, Worship, Sacraments, and Church Censures are the same, that were professed and performed under the late Prelacy*: So nothing sinful with us as to these. The only exception then of the Presbyterians against Communion with our Church, must have been its Government by Bishops. Now I proved that pretence could not justify their Separation, unless they could demonstrate the unlawfulness of Episcopacy, which is impossible to be done, and few or none in their Right Wits will assert it: Bishops have always been in the Church of Christ, and the want of them much Lamented by the Reformed Churches Abroad, add therefore the Conclusion stands firm and stable; That the Presbyterians by dividing from our *Episcopal Church* in the late Reigns were Schismatics, and continue such; for they have not changed their Model of Government, their Principles and Form of Worship, unless it be to the worse.

By this Argument in the *Plain Dealing* he Perceived himself hard-pressed: And therefore passeth it over in silence? what a Benefite it is for a Man to be so Wise, as not to medle with that which is too hard for him, and to forget what he hath no mind to Remember! Therefore instead of answering it, like a snaking Sophist he inverts it to serve (as he thinks) his own turn and substitutes in the *Minor*, the present Presbyterian Church in *Scotland*, as being duely constitute and requiring nothing unlawful, as a condition of Communion with it, and therefore, saith he, those that separate from Her are guilty of *Schism*. To this I answer his *Minor Proposition* is false in both parts of it, and his proofs neither solid nor satisfiing, as I hope will by and by appear: And first, it is not solely and meerly the want of Prelates (tho that be also a weighty prejudice against Communion with them; since they can be had) that makes their Constitution and Communion unlawful, but also their Schism from the Episcopal Church: They were Schismatics before the late Revolution as I have proved, and their prevailing now over the then established Church altereth not the Case; nor maketh their Schism cease to be Schism, for no external advantages whatsoever can change the Nature of things; And it has always been the sense of the *Catholick Church*, that Communion is not to be held with *Schismatics* continuing in their Schism; They must then purge themselves of *Schism*, which they can do most effectually by Reunion with their Brethren, and returning to the Church, from which they causelessly withdrew. Next, The want of Prelates to ordain & govern, is no small hindrance to the due Constitution of their Church: Nor doth the paralel from the *Reformed Churches abroad* to our *Presbyterians* at home hold, nor yet help the Matter, there being a vast Disparity betwixt the two, in these three Respects; 1. Because the *Reformed Churches* had great Reason to separate from and withdraw their Submission to their Bishops, who would not depart from the Communion of the Church of Rome, nor yeild to the casting of her heavy Yoke of destructive Errours, under which the Gospel Truths lay in a manner buried. 2. Because they sadly lamented the want of Bishops, and heartily wished they could be restored. 3. Because they never rejected or condemned that *Order of Prelats*, requiring it as a Condition of their Communion never to submit to them; But contrariwise, approv'd it in the Churches that had the Happiness to enjoy Bishops. For these three particulars you have the Testimonies of three Eminent Reformers, Calvin de *necess. Eccles. Reform.* Melancthon

Hist

9

bist. Confess. August. both already cited in the *Plain Dealing*. And then Beza himself, who speaking of the Church of *England*, was so far from believing that Men may or ought to separat from it upon the Account of *Prelacy*, that he prays earnestly to GOD, *That She may always remain in that happy Estate in which She hath been put and Preserved, by the Blood, by the Purity of the Faith, and by the wise Conduct of her Excellent Bishops.* Beza contra Sorra. ad cap. 8. art. 3. pag. 270. Edit. Francof. anno 1601. Besides these, you have of late the Testimonies of three Eminent Protestant Divines Abroad, *Monsieur le Moine* Professor of Divinity at *Leyden*, *Monsieur de l'Angle*, one of the Preachers of the Reformed Church Meeting at *Charenton*, near *Paris*; and the famous *Monsieur Claud* in their Letters to my Lord Bishop of *London*, annexed to Dr. *Stillingsfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation from the Communion of the Church of England*, wherein with great force of Argument they condemn the Dissenters from that Church, and draw a paralel betwixt them and the *Schismatics in the Primitive Church*, declaring, that their Opinion in that Matter is the same that is holden by their Churches Abroad, and wishes that all *Mistaken Christians in the World would receive their Reformation, &c.*

Now these things being considered, can any Man say, that our *Presbyterians* are in the same case with the *Reformed Churches Abroad*, and that their Communion is as safe and unexceptionable? I say our *Presbyterians*, who condemn all inequality among Ministers and Office Bearers in the Church: who in the Year 1638, in the *General Assembly at Glasgow*, not only Deposed the 14 Bishops and Excommunicated 8 of them, tho many sining there had sworn Canonical Obedience to them; but also abjured Episcopacy it self: and Dr. *Balcanquel* observes, that at the first Reading of the Act and calling the *Rolls* in order to Voteing, Mr. *Robert Baillies* Suffrage was Removed but not Abjured, and therefore at the second Reading and Voteing his Name was passed over, without asking his Vote. This Gentleman was the only Person (saith the Dr.) that went contrary to their intallible Leader in the *Rolls*, viz. Mr. *Alexander Hume* Minister at *Polwart*, whom they all followed unanimously in Voting, as if he had been guided by an unerring Spirit: and who, after the Re-establishment of Episcopacy in the Year 1662, did seditiously separate from our Church, to which in Duty they ought to have lived inseparably United, there being nothing profess'd or performed in it contrary to the word of GOD. And Finally, who in the Years 1688, 1689, Rabled and thrust the Episcopal Ministers out of their Churches,

and procured in end the B. shops to be Removed : And now for these several years, require it as a Condition of *Ministerial Communion*. That we declare our grief and sorrow for having served under Prelacy, and promise never again to comply with it, tho it were Re-established. Can Men of such Sentiments and Practices be equal'd to those of the *Reformed Churches* abroad, who differ from them in all these things? surely 'tis unreasonable to think, or assert it.

In the third place, I answer to his foresaid *Minor*, that they impose unlawful *Terms of Communion*; And therefore we cannot in Conscience joyn with them. This I prov'd in the *plain dealing*, &c. And reduced these *Terms* to three Heads, to wit, their *Government, Doctrine, and Worship*. see pages. 4. 5 6 7 8. To the first two he gives no answer at all, only makes a bare & maimed mention of them, & so lets them go. page 16. Whereas I insisted their at length, upon their sinful requiring our *Abrenunciation* of *Episcopacy*, and acknowledgement of *Presbytry*, as the true and only Government of the Church of *Christ*, which from the learned *Hooker* I proved to be but a new Model devised by *Calvin*; who himself never entertained such high thoughts of *Presbytry*, as (for its sake) to exclude *Episcopacy* out of the Church of God, for which I produced a pregnant Testimony out of his Treatise of the *necessity of the Reformation*. I insisted likewise on their imposing upon our Consciences by requiring our *Subscriptions* to all the propositions in the *Westminster Confession*; which being compil'd by Men, and containing in it many contraverted Doctrines, cannot be supposed to be of infallible verity; and therefore not imposed as our *Faith*, which that Subscription must import. All these things he passeth over in Silence; And is that to answer my Arguments? Is it not rather to sham the World, and to impose upon his Blind-led followers, that a full sufficient answer is made, while he doth nothing else but multiply words without knowledge, fill up page. after page with Misrepresentations, Falshoods, Childish stories, &c. These and the like are the Arts by which the *Presbyterian Cause* is maintained; but yet such, as should be abhorred by a sincere Lover of Truth, What! Doth he pretend to answer, and yet pass by some of the plainest and strongest Arguments, as if they had never been brought? and never take notice of the quotation out of *Calvin*, the founder of *Presbytry*, which is so material a Testimony, and so destructive to all he saith against *Prelacy*? What could have been more material to his purpose then to confute this, if it could have been done? And since he has not attempted the doing it I take it

to be the yielding up two main points at once, and well fair for once the Vindicators Ingenuity !

About the end of the 16 page, and pages 17. 18. 19. 20. He begins to answer my Charge of the notable defects in the Presbyterian Worship, and with a goodly confidence affirms : *That many of these particulars were excluded by the universal practice of prelatical Ministers, and condescends on these three, private Baptism, private Communion and the Commemoration, at set times, of the great Mysteries of our Redemption, whereof he says none were observed in the time of Episcopacy, save that of the Nativity of our Lord called Christsmas day, in some particular places, and under the Prelats Nose.* But did our Church ever make Acts against these ? Can he or any Man instruct, That Prelatical Ministers refused *private Baptism or Communion* in case of necessity and danger of Death ? I know they have been administrat in private, as occasion required, and I my self have administr'd both these Sacraments in private, when desired. How then can he say they were excluded by our practice ? What evidence doth he bring for this ? O yes ! an irrefragable evidence, p. 17. he does not remember, he never heard tell it was so : And who should withstand such convincing proofs ? As for the Commemoration of our *Lords Nativity, Circumcision, Passon, &c.* We observed these at the set times according to the practice of the *Catholick Church*, and preached on Texts suitable to the solemnity, *Verbum Dei in Die suo*, which proves they were not forgotten, much less excluded by our Church.

But on the other hand, I wonder how he adventures to affirm, p. 16. *That all the particulars enumerated in the Plain Dealing, are not excluded by the practice of the Presbyterians, except a very few :* He try to make it good, that they are all excluded. Of *private Communion* to dying Persons that earnestly desire it, and *Observation* of set times for Commemorating the great *Mysteries* of our *Redemption*, I see there is no dispute. I find they are among his exceptions, and he contends not for them. The first then at which he begins is *private Baptism*, p. 17. which (he saith) *they refuse not to weak dying Infants that cannot be brought to Church.* If it be so, that they are indeed come this length, I heartily Rejoice and Bless GOD for it, but I mightily doubt it, and sure I am it was refused some time ago, and many Infants dyed without *Baptism* through their *Refusal* ; some in the Church it self, some in the way going thither, and some at home, both in City and Country : whereof many instances can be given. But I would ask ; if all the Presbyterian Ministers do Admi-

nister

ister this *Sacrament* on such *Occasions*, every where throughout the Kingdom? I suppose this *Vindicator* cannot make this good, and 'twill be found that 'tis only done in some particular places, where Episcopal Ministers may be had, and where the *Refusal* is most Noticed, and gives the greatest Scandal. I would ask next, do any of these Brethren now Administer it out of a *principle*, that *Baptism* is a necessary instituted Means of Salvation, without which Infants do not obtain *Remission of Sin*, Sanctification of their Nature, and so no Salvation, in the Ordinary way prescribed in the Holy Gospel? or do they it out of any other motive? Sure their *current Doctrine* is, that *Baptism* is not necessary to Salvation. And agreeably to this, their *Confession of Faith*, Chap 28 saith, *That Grace and Salvation are not so inseparably annexed to it, as that no person can be Regenerated or saved without it.* And some of their Followers, in my own hearing, applyed that of St. Paul to the Galatians Cap. 5. 6. *In Jesus Christ, neither Circumcision availeth anything, nor Uncircumcision, &c. unto Baptism*; insinuating plainly it was not necessary; and probably they were so taught too. Now if this be the Principle of our Presbyterians, as certainly it is, then it is certainly false, that none of them refuse *Baptism* to weak dying Infants in private Houses, in every part of the Kingdom, where they are required. And I have this good Reason for my Assertion; Because it is still supposed, that every good and wise Man, will Order and Govern his Actions according to his Sentiments. In confirmation of all this, I add these two Considerations; The one is, That the Deceased Mr. John Hamilton, who was one of the few that took the Freedom to Baptize in Private, was Nick-named by his Party, *John the Baptist*, for his so doing; the other is, The Act of their General Assembly at Edinburgh 31. October, 1690. *ante Meridiem.*

X

A C T Anent the Administration of the SACRAMENTS,

Eadem Sessione.

THE General Assembly considering, That the two Sacraments that CHRIST hath appointed under the New Testament, viz. Baptism and the LORD's Supper are his Solemn Ordinances, and Seals of the Covenant of Grace, (which is held forth in Preaching of the Gospel, And that in the use of them, the Parties receiving them are solemnly devoted and engaged

to GOD, before Angels and Men, and are solemnly received as Members of the Church, and do entertain Communion with Her: And by the Authority of this Church, in her former Assemblies, the private use of them hath been condemned: As also, that by allowing the private use of the same, in pretended Cases of necessity, the Superstitious Opinion is nourished, that they are necessary to Salvation, not only as Commanded Duties, but as means without which Salvation cannot be attained. Therefore, the Assembly hereby Discharges the Administration of the LORD's Supper, to such persons in their Houses, and all other use of the same, except in the publick Assemblies of the Church. And also doth discharge the Administration of Baptism in private, That is, in any place or at any time, when the Congregation is not orderly called together, to wait on the Dispensing of the word. And appoints that this be carefully observed, when and wherever the LORD giveth his People Peace, Liberty and Opportunity for their publick Assemblies. And ordains this present Act to be published and intimate in all the Churches.

This puts the Question beyond all Doubt, and declares, that he has a Brow of Brass that openly avers, that Private Baptism is not refused to weak Infants; whereas, the Assembly, in Imitation of their worthy Predecessors, discharges the Administration of it, in any place, or at any time, and that for the weighty and justifiable Reasons mentioned in the Act. How a General Council of all the Reformed Churches, could it be obtained, would relish such an Act, 'tis easie to divine. This then is, you see, the Principle of the Presbyterians; for no Men of common Understanding and Sense, would make such an Act against their own Minds, and discharge that which they believe to be both Just, necessary and Pious; especially when they were under no Force or Violence, but had full power to pass, or not to pass it: And as it is their Principle, so it is their Practice too, unless it be in some few places and Instances, where they do it but grudgingly and against the Hair. To which I add, That since both Sacraments in private, are coupled together and discharged in the same Act, it is evident they are as much against the one as the other; and that they give the LORD's Supper in private, they neither do, nor can pretend. And this is a third particular excluded out of their way of Worship.

Next, *ibid.* (for I must follow his own Order, confused as it is) He says, It's certain, Presbyterians either stand or kneel in time of Prayer, and allow that to be a decent Gesture. A great Favour indeed it is they do

so I. Yet their own *Amestus* can tell them, that *Seffo non est Gellus Adorandi*. But how proves he this, that Presbyterians either *Stand* or *Kneel*, since they are observed to sit on their Breech, both Men and Women, generally throughout the Kingdom? Yea, the Brethren themselves too are noticed to do so: If this be true that he saith, *Truth never looked more like a Lie*. The same is to be said of their hearing *Sermon uncovered*, as he affirms; tho in the populous and more Civilized Places of the Nation, many be found in their Congregations, who observe these Reverend Gestures in time of Praying and Preaching; yet for the most part, they are Persons of *Episcopal Principles* and *Education*, and the Presbyterians that do so, owe it not to their *Principles* and *Breeding*, but either to the good Example of the *Prelatists*, or (as I shall charitably Judge) to the *Grace of GOD*, that restrains them from behaving so irreverently in His Sight and Presence, as the Vulgar sort among them do; whom, I have observed in time of Prayer to give but *Half-Cap*, and scarce the same, to the *Great and Dreadful Majesty of Heaven and Earth*.

He goes on, and saith p. 17. I deal not fairly in alledging, that by an *implicite Faith*, we must promise to conform to whatsoever the Kirk shall afterwards Authorize and ordain; And for *Confutation* of this he adduces as an Argument, that which I have been confuting all along, and that is the *Formula* of the *Terms* required by the Assembly, of those that are received into *Ministerial Communion*. Now supposing, that the Account of the *Terms* which he gives were full and true, as it is not, yet how doth it confute what I alledged? are not these very words (*viz. And their Majesties with Advice and Consent foresaid, Statute and Ordain, That Uniformity of Worship, and of the Administration of all publick Ordinances within this Church be observed by all the saids Ministers and Preachers, as the same are at present performed, and allowed therein, or shall be hereafter declared by the Authority of the same, and that no Minister or Preacher be admitted or continued for hereafter, unless that he Subscribe to observe, and do actually observe the foresaid Uniformity.*) contained in the A^c made in behalf of the Kirk, A^c 23. Parliament June 12. 1693. And who knows what they may hereafter declare by their Authority, when they have opportunity and Power? *si adverserint vires*, according to the Language of *Lex Rex*, and *Jus Populi*, &c. But that this Account is not full and true is manifest; Because the Express *Abrenunciation* of *Episcopal Principles* is altogether left out and that they require this is so notourly known, that it cannot be denied by themselves: And is acknowledged by this *Vindicator* in his Postscript to his Letter.

Here

Here as to the Uniformity we must observe with them in Worship, it is to be marked, that he skips over the saying the *LORD's Prayer*, the rehearsing the *Creed in Baptism*, *Kneeling at Receiving the Holy Communion*; Whereas that irreverent, saucy custome of sitting was first Introduced by the *Arians*, who looking upon *Christ* no otherwise then their Elder Brother, thought it not Robbery at all to be equal with him, and to sit down with him at his own *Table*. Now being they omit these, such Ministers as join them must forbear them too, since their own practice is the Standard of *Uniformity* in Worship. By all which it evidently appears, as I concluded in the *Plain Dealing*, that their *Terms of Ministerial Communion* are sinful, and a necessity is laid upon us of holding a distinct Communion from them.

How absurd is it to adduce *Stillingsfleet*, *Burnet*, *Usher*, &c. as Patrons of the *Presbyterian Cause*, Men who have written in defence of *Episcopacy*, and the validity of its *Orders*? The most favourable of the three might be for receiving *Dissenters* into the Communion of the Church of *England* by way of *Comprehension*, but never for subjecting that Church unto them, which is the Case betwixt us and our *Scottish Presbyterians*. But this, as many others of the like stuff, merits no Answer.

That our *Presbyterian Brethren* should cast out the Reading of the *Scriptures*, from their Publick Assemblies, an Ordinance appointed by *GOD* for the Instruction of his Church, in which the Honour of the *Scriptures*, and the Salvation of Souls are so deeply concerned, is a very sad and wounding Contemplation; and that to give some pretext to this considerable and willfull Omission, they should do no more but only read some small parcel thereof, with a tedious and long winded *Gloss*, which I am afraid is sometimes like that of *Orleance*, which, as we commonly say, destroyed or obscured the *Text*. This looks like a kind of symbolizing with the Church of *Rome*, for as they deny the free Use of the *Scriptures* to the People, and hide *GOD's Word* in a strange Language, so our *Presbyterian Brethren* banish it out of their Religious Meetings. Whereas seeing the *Holy Scriptures* are acknowledged by all the *Reformed Churches*, to be the *Infallible Rule of our Faith and Manners*, plain in all things necessary for Salvation, able to make us wise thereunto, through Faith, which is in *JESUS CHRIST*, and are written for our Learning and Comfort: Therefore it is, that they ought to be read over in order to the People, publickly and solemnly, that they may hear *GOD Himself* speaking unto them, (for the Words are His, tho the Articulation be

ours

ours, and as much cannot be said of their *Human Glosses*) and so may be thoroughly acquainted with the whole Body of the Scriptures, and instructed in their Duty, and the Will of GOD revealed in them. This is a Means appointed by GOD for attaining the *Saving Knowledge of Himself*, and his good Ways, and has always been observed both in the *Jewish* and *Christian Church*: Yea the *Directory* for Publick Worship, approved by the General Assembly, and engrossed with its Acts, prescribes, *That ordinarily one Chapter of each Testament be read at every Meeting, and sometimes more, when the Chapters be short, or the Coherence of the Matter requireth it, and that all the Canonical Books be read over in Order, beginning the reading the next LORD's Day, where it ended the last.*

Yet this new Sett of Men has not only swerved from the Constitution of their Predecessors in this, as in other points, but also from the Institution and Ordinance of GOD Himself. How can they account for this? yes, very well. *'Tis no defect in their Worship*, saith the *Vindicator*, p. 18. 19. *No Sensible Man will say so; for they read the Scriptures, and add an Interpretation, according to the Example Nehemiah 8. so their way is unexceptionable*; thus saith he. But how much do they read? Two Chapters, or more, at every Meeting, and orderly in the Course of the Scriptures? No, not one entire Chapter, but a few Verses, and that but once in the Forenoon on the LORD's Day.

What! is this to give Obedience to the *Divine Appointment* of Reading the Scriptures, or is it not rather, to neglect that, and to make room for their own Discourses, Lectures and Sermons? *Interpreting and applying the Scriptures* and exhorting the Congregation from them is no where called *the Reading of the Scriptures*. Neither will the Example from *Nehemiah* help him, for this was after the Captivity, the People had been Born and Educated in a strange Land, had changed their Language, and did not understand, at least Universally, the pure *Hebrew*, in which the Law was first written, and therefore it was necessary that it should be Interpreted, Expounded, or Translated to them in the Language they then understood best, and accordingly When *Ezra* Read the Law to the People; a certain number of Priests and Levites interpreted the words of it, so it is said there; *they caused the People to understand the Law, they caused them to understand the Reading*; But before the Captivity no such Custom was in use. We find no such Interpretation or Paraphrase added to the Reading of it in *Josiah's* time, 2. Chron. 34. 29, 30. and downwards. Now we have a plain *Authentick Translation* of the Scriptures

in a Language which we understand, and so no need of tedious *Glosses* and *Applications* at the reading of them, they being perspicuous and plain, and by the Grace of GOD, accompanying his own *Ordinance*, applying themselves with Force and Efficacy unto the Hearts of Devote humble and attentive Hearers, filling their Souls with Holy Ardours awaking and Rousing up their drowsie Spirits into Heavenly Sallies, lively and vigorous Emotions, as many good Men can testify from their own Experience. And that the *Scriptures* were read *without Gloss*, in the Apostles time, appears from *Acts* 15. 21. and *Coloss.* 4. 16. Where St. Paul saith; *When this Epistle is read among you, cause it to be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans: and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea: here reading enjoined; but never a word of adding a Gloss or Comment.*

It is true we find *Comments* and *Exhortations* made to the People in publick *Assemblies* upon some part of *GODS Word*, not only practised but enjoined. When our Saviour, *Luke* 4. had read a Portion of *Scripture* out of *Isaiah* 61. 1, 2. he closed the Book, and applied it to the People in a Discourse to that purpose. And St. Paul chargeth *Timothy* to give attendance to *Reading, Exhortation, and Doctrine*, 1. *Tim.* 4. 13. But this doth not prove, that they went inseparably and indispensibly together, as our *Presbyterians* contend, but were indeed distinct parts of the publick *Worship*.

There remains yet a weak and peevish *Objection* against our practice in this Matter, adduced as a pretence to justify this their great Omission of not Reading, &c. but which doth rebound with greater force upon himself and his Parry, and it is this, *it will be hard to prove* (saith he) *that any Person not in orders has Right to read the Scriptures in publick, or perform any of CHRIST's Ordinances, which yet our Church allowed:* Since this he affirms, it was incumbent on him to prove it too. But why may not Men, who have given Tryal of their probity, gravity and good Behaviour be Authorized by the Church for such an Office, and yet not advanced to Holy Orders? And many such Readers under Prelacy, were Deacons, Probationers, such as attended the *Schools of the Prophets*, I mean *Divinity Lessons*, and intended the Ministry. He must know that in the *Primitive Church*, besides *Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons*, there were others that bear Office in the Church, such as *Sub-Deacons, Readers, Singers, Acolyths, Porters*, &c. But every Church was not furnished with all these Officers, and they were but of *Ecclesiastical Institution*;

tation; so that while he condemns our Episcopal Church, for Authorizing Readers not in Orders, he withal Condemns the practice of the Primitive Church. But I need not go so far back, they can easily be confuted from their own practice. I ask then, is not *singing praise to GOD*, an essential part of *Publick Worship*? Who then gave their *Precentors* Right to perform it, they not being in Orders? Have they it not from the Authority and Allowance of their *Kirk*? It appears then some parts of the *Publick Ordinances*, even themselves being Judges, can be perform'd by Persons that want Orders. But I ask again, if no Person not in Orders can perform any of *CHRIST's Publick Ordinances*, as this *Vindicator* affirms, then how can he and his Brethren justify their practice, in allowing their *Novices*, *Expectants* or *Probationers* (call them how you please) that are not in Orders, to perform all the usual parts of publick Worship. Praying, Reading, Lecturing and Preaching in their Congregations? The Brethren do not boggle at this, nor have any scruple of Conscience about it, but if you speak to them, that the Scriptures be read to the People, tho it be by persons not in Orders, O! then they fly in your Face, and tell you, *such Men have no Right nor Commission from Christ to do so*. Is not this impudence with a Witness? Doth not their foresaid practice evidently confute this pretence? Has a Man not in Orders more *Right and Commission from Christ to Pray, Read, Lecture and Preach in publick*, then to Read the word of GOD without a Gloss, sure, no reasonable Man will assert it, and from unreasonable and absurd Men, whom no *Topick* can conclude, Good Lord deliver us, 2 *Thess.* 3. 2. It is not then, nor can be matter of Conscience with the Presbyterian Brethren to withstand the publick Reading of Gods word without a Gloss; but the true Reason seems to be this; they at first did rashly and sinfully lay aside the performance of that Ordinance, as they did some other parts of Worship, the *LORD's Prayer, Doxology and Creed*, to distinguish themselves from the *Episcopal Church*; And now it stands them upon their Reputation not to recall and retrieve these *Badges of Discrimination*, lest the Brethren should appear to have erred, and withall should incur the *Censures and Clamours* of their People. This point of *Reading &c.* is so Material, that I have dwelt the longer on it, I could have accumulate many more Arguments to this purpose, but I think, I have said enough.

As for the Binding Parents and Children to the *Westminster Confession*, &c. laying aside the *Creed in Baptism*, the *laying the LORDS Prayer*, he makes no Reply, but Refers me to what he has said already on these heads,

heads, and indeed I commend his Wisdom in so doing; for his Answers are so fully confuted and baffled by the Author of the Case, &c. that it was not for his Honour to produce them in publick again. But that they use the *Doxology* to the *Blessed Trinity* in their Worship, he brings very fine Evidence; *all the hearers* (saith he p. 19.) *will bear Record that every Sermon is concluded with the Doxology, and usually the Prayers too.* What a Presbyterian juggle is this? did I ever Charge them as *Anti-Trinitarians*? was it not only with the omission of *singing* or *saying* that *Divine Hymn* in the formal and express words used by the Church, *Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be World without end, Amen?* This he knew was the Question under debate, and it is manifest, they neither sing nor say it in these express words, tho *Arianism*, and *Deism*, hath again lifted the head so high, as one expresseth it.

The *Vindicator* in the next place, p. 20, saith, *I firmly believe, yea, and its consistent with my certain Knowledge, that the more and most knowing and Judicious in the Kingdom make no doubt of the validity of Presbyterian Ordination.* This Man, you see, has great Faith, but since he has certain Knowledge of the Matter of Fact, why calls he in Faith to its assistance? it is like 'tis for want of a Demonstration; he hath neither a Physical nor Moral certainty about this matter. And no wonder it is so, we having so much Reason to doubt, and so very little to be secure of the validity of *Ordinations* that are not *Episcopal*: and the Reasons to doubt that *Presbyterian Ordinations* are valid, are very material, and fully set down by the Author of a *brief Examination of some things in Mr. Mel-drum's Sermon, &c.* to which I refer him.

Ibid. He goes quite off from the Business, as Men are glad to do, that know they are not like to bring it to a good issue, and raises a calumnious Out-cry against us, as misrepresenting *Presbyterian Preachers* so, that People have looked upon them to be Monsters, until they fell into Company with them, and that in some parts of the North, *Prelatical Ministers* had given such strange Accounts of them, that the People did not believe they were like other Men, no nor so much as in Form and Figure. That the Children were taught to hold out the finger and cry *Cammy, Cammy*, to *Presbyterian Preachers*; and Young and old would have run to the Doors, when they heard of one of them passing by, expecting to see some strange Sight, &c. On these Stories he bestows near a page. Very likely Stories indeed! Romance and Fiction all over. I had

had almost said, that the *Pindicator* who reports such incredible, ridiculous, Childish Tattles, as certain Truths, as he often doth, and the Simple People who have such a sturdy Faith as to believe them, deserve to have the Blessing of Cardinal Caroffa bestowed upon them; who (as *Jacob. August. Thuan. ad annum 1556. Edit. Paris 1604.* relates the Story) entering Paris with great Pomp as Legate from the Pope, and the People from all Quarters flocking to him, to be blest by him, he, lifting up his Eyes devoutly to Heaven, and frequently making the sign of the Cross instead of the accustomed Form of Benediction, is said to have often muttered these words. *Quandequidem Populus iste vult decipi, decipiaur.* Seeing this people will be deceived, let them be deceived. But my heart's Desire and Prayer to GOD is, that they may not be given up to a Spirit of delusion, to believe lies.

I had said in the *Plain Dealing*, that Some Presbyterianus had been reordained by Bishops after 1662, which was an Argument, they doubted the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination. To this he replies, *ibid.* The more foolish were the Re-ordained and the Re-ordainers. And is not this a solid and satisfactory Answer, think ye? And whereas he says, if Episcopal Ordination had been necessary, then all that complied with Prelacy had been Re-ordained.

To this I answer, That some of them had formerly been ordained by Bishops, and those that were not, upon their Submission to the Bishops, receiving Collation, and taking the Oath of Canonical Obedience, had full Allowance from their Bishops to exercise the power of Presbyters, which was equivalent to Episcopal Ordination in that Case, and so there was no Necessity of Re-ordaining all.

Thus I have examined and answered all that he brings against my Arguments in the *Plain Dealing*, which I produced, to prove that We of the Episcopal Perswasion cannot join with the present Presbyterians, upon the Account of the Sinful Terms of Communion with them, and leave it to the Impartial Reader, to judge whether or not as yet they stand altogether unshaken; and consequently a Toleration is highly Reasonable and absolutely necessary.

I go forward now to examine his Reply to my Answers made to other whiffling Reasons for no necessity of a Toleration, I find nothing new, but the old *Mumpsimus* still. Repetitions, Tergiversations, Falsehoods, &c.

It is irksome to enter upon his indistinct Rhapsodie, but I must do it to silence, and stop, if possible, the Eternal Clank of his Tongue, and Strokes of his Pen.

To what is answered by me to his Appeal, *Plain Dealing* p 8 & 9, *That the Matters wherein we differ from the Presbyterians, neither are nor ever were reckoned indifferent by Us, &c.* To this he replies only, *that this is not manifest*; and so forth renews his Appeal, page 21. If it be not manifest to him, as it is to me, and, I think to all unprejudicat Men, then he should have produced incontrollable Evidences to the contrary, which he neither hath done, nor can do: As may appear by my foresaid Answers to his Replys concerning the Matters in difference betwixt Us. But that these Matters are not indifferent, will appear by these few Questions, Is his Beloved *Parity* among the *Ministers* of the *Church*, a Matter indifferent, either with *Him*, or *Us*? Is the Subscribing their new Creed, the *Westminster Confession*, as containing nothing but Wholesome and Godly Doctrine, a thing indifferent? Is the excluding out of the publick Worship, the *Reading of the Holy Scriptures*, even without a Gloss, the saying of the *Lords Prayer*, the Singing the *Doxology*, the laying aside the *Creed* in *Baptism*, the Refusing *Baptism* to dying Infants that cannot be brought to Church, and the *Communion of the Body and Blood of CHRIST* to a dying Christian, that earnestly desires it, so denying the Means of Grace to Men, whom they have most need of them; are all these matters Indifferent? for shame, this Man should give over arguing, or do it to better purpose.

Ibid. To our being cast out by insolent Rables, without a Legal hearing, and never yet receiving a Redress of the wrong, nor so much as liberty to exercise our Ministry, which is penalty upon penalty. *Pl. Deal.* p. 9.

He Replies, *This is accounted for already*: But I am afraid that all who contributed to that Barbarous usage of the Ministers of *Christ*, have it to account for Yet. I wish them hearty Remorse, for that Sacrilegious guilt, that the sin may never be laid to their Charge. And whatever sorrow or shame, upon reflex thoughts, the Actors have conceived, who were put on by others, and turned out all without exception, as they were instructed, so far as their Power could Reach; sure I am of this, it has been great grief of Heart to many in the Land, who were bereaved of their *Pastors*, maugre all their pressing instances and solemn Protestations to the contrary. We know well enough where to lay the blame of that *Rabbling*. Their Preachers were not free of it; I could instance in one of them now dead, who sent about to Episcopal Ministers peremptory written Summons of Removal by the hands of the *Rable*,
F
whereof

whereof I have one: but I forbear to Name him, for I love not to Rake amongst the Ashes of the dead. An illegal and violent driving of Men, the *Ministers of Religion*, out of their Rights and Possessions is not Justifiable in any Nation, 'tis downright Oppression, and an expresse breach of our *Saviours* Golden Rule of Equity; *Quod tibi heri non vis, &c.*

And for this *Vindicator* to say, *Ibid*, *It was not penal to the People that drove us away*, is upon the Matter to approve the Fact, which ill becomes a *Preacher of Righteousness*. And it is as unsuitable for such a Man, to call a generally known Matter of Fact, a *notorious falsehood*, Namely, *that we suffered upon the account of our Persuasion*. Some Meeting House Ministers, by their procurement, being Imprisoned or Banished. I had referred these severe proceedings of the Presbyterians against us to another place, in the *Plain-Dealing*, p. 14. where near a page is filled up with instances to that purpose, and the *Vindicator* being Conscious to himself, That the Matters of Fact were undenyable, and easie to be proven, Therefore he passeth them all over in silence. What can be said of this Man, who Matters not, what he deny or affirm?

Ibid. page 9. I affirmed that the Grounds and Reasons exhibited in my Paper, demonstrated sufficiently our Scruples, and that a *Toleration* would ease our Consciences, and challenged him to produce as good and weighty Reasons for the Presbyterians, separating formerly from our Communion and Worship, and we should readily acquit them from the guilt of *Schism*, was not this a fair Offer? Could any thing be more material for his purpose, then to get himself and's Party freed from the fore-said Charge? But finding it impossible to be done, he has never attempted the doing it; and all that he returns me, page 21, is an impertinent Banter, *that I had considered, but not answered his Assertion, &c.* Whatsoever is pungent he offers not to touch it, more than it were a hot Coal. He affirms in his Letter, p. 4. *That all the Aim of a Toleration is to furnish a Maintenance to a few Episcopal Ministers*; whereupon I inferred Logically and Rationally enough, that by that Expression, he tacitly acknowledges there are many in the Kingdom willing to afford us Maintenance, that they may enjoy the Benefit of our Ministry. But this he saith, p. 21, he will not acknowledge, that there are many in the Kingdom willing to afford it. It is all one to me, whether he acknowledge it or not: Its sufficient for my purpose, that it follows naturally and necessarily from his own words, if so be they contain any Sense or Reason in them. Because, for him to say that a *Toleration* to Episcopal Ministers

to Preach, hath only this Aim, to furnish them Maintainance, and yet to deny that there are any people that will afford it for their Works sake, is, if I understand ought at all, to speak Contradiction and Nonsense. Neither would such a *Toleration* rob the Poor of the Parishoners Charity, as he alledges is done in a certain *Shire* in *Scotland*, p. 21. For at present the Collections in the Meeting houses of *Elgin*, *Alves*, *Duffus* and new *Aberdeen*, go all to the Poor, except what is given to Readers and Beddals; and the like Care would be also taken, if a *General Toleration* were once granted.

Ibid. He wretchedly misrepresents and perverts my Argument, with his own Additions and Alterations: It runs thus; *If it was not unlawful to continue an hundred Episcopal Ministers in their Legal Rights, it is far less so, to Tolerat their Brethren, who have lived peaceably these fourteen years, divested of their Churches and Benefices.* Now here any Man may see the Consequence is both Logical and strong.

But this *Vindicator* or *Calumniator* turns it into this ugly shape, p. 22. *If the State (saith he) hath protected those in their Churches, that owned the Civil Authority, by the same Reason they are bound to grant a Toleration to those that refuse to own the Civil Authority.* Can there be more dishonest and disingenuous Dealing? what would a *Jesuite* do more? this then is one way to Answer my Arguments by misrepresenting them. But this is not all, he must next play the Buffoon, and vent his witless Writicism too; *If he means (saith he, speaking of my foresaid Argument) that it is far less unlawful to Tolerat those Prelatical Ministers that are peaceable, to live divested of their Churches and Benefices, &c. I am of his mind.* Will any Rational Man say, that these words of mine (*viz. it is far less so, to Tolerat their Brethren, who have lived peaceably these fourteen years, divested of their Churches and Benefices*) do, or can bear this Sense or rather Nonsense he forces upon them? he must needs be deeply drenched in malice, who cavils, when the sense is obvious. The Fraternity should advise him to leave the pretty facetious Artifices of Wit to others, they are not for every head, *ne sutor ultra crepidam*: I doubt it is an Eye-sore to him and his Party, that we are suffered to live in the Kingdom, even without Churches and Benefices, *Det Deus immitti cornua curta Bovi*: The Good God incline the Hearts of our Queen and Governours to restrain them, for their Anger is fierce, and their wrath is cruel; as for the Reproaches he casts fallily upon us, which hath been the constant practice and Jargon of that Tribe these fourteen

fourteen years bygone, I shall only say with St. Augustine, whoſoever detracts from our good Name, adds to our Reward, according to that of our Blessed Saviour, *Matth. 5. 11. 12. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, &c.* Here again comes in another groſs miſrepresentation of my words. In his Letter, page 4, he had ſaid, *Their Church was willing to receive Us, and the terms were moſt eaſie &c.*; Of their Terms enough hath been ſaid, and the Repetition of them is become nauſeous. As to the other their willingness to receive us, I answered it was too bare faced for him to affirm it: their unjuſt and cruel proceedings, againſt many complying Miniſters are not yet forgotten, the Proceſſes are ſtill extant. He Replies, p. 23. *By this I have forfeited the Character of a Plain Dealer,* I ask him how ſo? To this he ſays, *It is the very firſt time that ever he heard a Proceſs intended againſt any complying and aſſumed Miniſter: and if I mean ſuch as was Qualified to the State, but were not aſſumed, then I am raving for we, ſaith he, are ſpeaking of aſſumption into Miniſterial Communion.* Now, by the very Threed of the Diſcourſe, *Plain Dealing* page 12. any Body may ſee I was ſpeaking againſt their pretended *Willingneſs* and *Readineſs* to *Aſſume*, and not of actual *Aſſumption*, which my very next words (*viz. And how unworthily have ſome been treated that went over to them*) do manifeſtly prove? ſo 'tis himſelf that roves, and not I: I was ſpeaking of their Aversion to receive and *aſſume* *Prelatical Miniſters*, and of Maltreating ſuch, as having complied with the Government, might probably have come in to them at long run, had they not been ſo ill uſed; But he miſrepresents me as ſpeaking of *Miniſters actually aſſumed*. Whether this or the late frequent Commiſſions be imputable to his Underſtanding or Will, I leave it to the Reader to judge.

For the unworthy Treatment of Mr. Lundie and others aſſumed, he makes no Defence, and I paſs it too: Only I will give you a remarkable inſtance of their innate Aversion to receive Episcopall Miniſters amongſt them, whatever they craftily pretend, and 'tis this. Mr. John Ainſley (who had ſerved long in the Miniſtry, firſt at Hopkirk, afterwards at Exname, both lying within the Presbytry of Jedburgh) a grave and good Man, ſound and powerful in Doctrine, and unblameable in Life, beloved and well eſteemed by all that knew him; was about the beginning of the Revolution, prevailed upon by his Friends to comply and qualify himſelf, they aſſuring him that upon his Submiſſion to the Government of Church and State, the Presbyterians would aſſume him into Miniſterial Communion with them: And in perſwading him to this, Bonjedward who was his Friend, and one of their

of their Ruling Elders was very active. The poor Gentleman, being come by ten or twelve forcible Arguments, I mean so many small Children, and by the fair Promises and Assurances made to him, yielded unto the importunity of his Friends. When this is done, Mr. Gabriel Sample told him, he behoved to dimitt his Ministry at Oxname, which was a good Living, and they would admit him to any other place, to which he should get a Call. Mr. Ainsley was at first loath to consent to this, in regard he had the Love of his People, a Numerous Family, and that the Benefice was considerably great, yet knowing there was no contending with them, at length he dimitts at Donho me before the Presbytrie. Upon this Hopkirk being Vacant, a Place of a turkish Stipend, and his old Parish, the Heritors and Parishoners thereof were going to give him a Call, which, how soon the Presbytrie understood, immediately they raise a most calumnious Libel against him, and lead 50 or 60 Witnesses to prove it, and so they fall to work with him, and toss him from one Presbytrie day at this place, to another Presbytrie day at another place, and so continued to harass the poor Man for the space of 10 or 12 Moneths. At last, he is brought before them at Minto, where they detained him in the Church Yard above 3 hours in a violent cold frosty day, whereby he was cast into a Sickness whereof he dyed; Reproach and bad Usage having brack his heart.

After his death, their next Synod meeting at Kells, and there being nothing proven of what was libelled against him by any of the Witnesses; It was mov'd by Mr. Robert Wyllie then at Selkirk; that for the Credit of his Memorie he might be ossailzied, and was seconded by Mr. Thomas Shields at Todshaugh, and several others, and thus it carryed, as may be seen in their Synod Book and Register. This I think is no great proof of their Willingness to receive any Episcopal Minister into Communion with them.

This *Vindicator* comes next, page 23 to make a seeming Reply to my Answers made to his Arguments for the Inconveniencies of a Toleration.

To the first of these, Letter page 4. I answered at length, Plain Dealing page 10. That in Reason it cannot be pretended; That a Toleration to Men of known peaceable Principles and Deportment, would increase Breaches and Tumultuary Disorders, &c. And this Breaches and Disorders he means, are nothing else, but the Prelatists starting aside from the Presbyterian Preachers, as he plainly tells us in that Paragraph of his Letter; And is this any more than the Presbyterians did, deserting Episcopal Ministers upon the granting of King James's Toleration? Now to all that is said by me upon this head, he returns, page 23, nothing but

Slandrous Accusations, and bitter Invektives against Us, as being neither Men of Peace nor of Pity, but both unpeaceable and cruel; which shews he was all on a fire at the Writing thereof. Sed non in Commotione Dominus! GOD is not in the Fire of Men's Rage, nor in the Storm of their Passion, but in the soft Gale of Grace. I know the Presbyterian Rabble to exculpate themselves, falsely pretend that the Prelatists in *Glasgow* were the first Aggressors, as usually they make lies their Refuge, and Falshood their hiding place. And now this *Vindicator* by believing and publishing it as a certain Truth, hath merited Cardinal *Carossa's* Benediction, as also he doth in many other Instances, whereof another followeth just at the heels of the last; And it is this.

P. 24 *Some disaffected Persons in Elgin* (saith he) *together with a Company gathered out of several Congregations in the Country on the Lords Day, invaded one of the Churches in that Town, which they still possess, notwithstanding that there are two Ministers legally settled there upon the most unanimous Calls.* The true Matter of Fact is this, The Town of *Elgin* having but one Church, and Provision for two Ministers annually, and finding their Parishoners straitened in Accommodation for the Publick Worship, thow the Residence of *Englishmen* amongst them, who kept a constant Garrison there; Repaired their *Old Quire*, which was much decayed, adding to it a third part more for accommodating the Parishoners in Town and Landward, and made a Voluntary Contribution for maintaining a third Minister, during the Usurpation. But upon the happy Restauration of King *Charles II*, they being willing to be eased of their foresaid burden, returned all to their *Old Church*, contenting themselves with two Ministers, as formerly. Thus it continued for several years, until about the year 1669, That Bishop *M'kenzie* of Worthy and Pious Memory, set the Design on foot again; but the Teinds of the Paroch being exhausted, the great Difficulty was, how to settle a Stipend upon a third Minister, for effecting which, the Good Bishop proposes a Voluntary Contribution, and to quicken others, to do it chearfully; he leads the way himself, and offers a considerable portion, which he paid yearly out of his own Pocket; The like in a good measure did Mr. *James Horn* Minister there; so did the Community; and particularly the *Town-Trades* stented themselves Voluntarily in a third share. Upon this Fund, Mr. *James Hamilton* is settled in that Kirk, called the *Little or East Kirk*, where he continued 4 or 5 years; But finding he could not obtain a Legal Establishment of that Fund, many of the Contributors being but Liferenters, he embraces the first

First Offer of a Church with a Legal Provision, and Removes thence.

Since which time to this day, they have wanted a third Minister in the *little East Church* for want of a Stipend to it, tho the Parishioners both in *Town* and *Landward* be very Numerous; so that neither is it planted, nor have the twenty Merk Men had benefite by the Vacancy, nor have the two Presbyterian Incumbents in *Elgin*, nor any other Preached in it, one *Lords Day* since the Revolution: they not being willing to Labour, where they were to receive no wages. Whereupon the *Parishioners of the Episcopal Perswasion*, both in *Town* and *Landward*, finding the said *East Church* empty and unpossessed, and being encouraged by *Her Majesty's Letter*, applyed to the *Town-Council* of *Elgin*, for the use of it for Divine Worship; they only having Right to dispose of it who had been at the Charges of Building and Plenishing it: And upon their Application made, *The Town-Council* by their *Act* delivered up the *Keys* to them, allowing them *that Church* for the foresaid use. Upon which the People voluntarily stented themselves and made up a competent Maintenance for an Episcopal Minister, who *Officers* there every *Lords Day*. Now where is there any just ground of Complaint here? What Disorder is committed either by the *Good Town* or *Parishioners*? What Intrusion or Invasion is made upon any Church possessed by *Presbyterians*, or that hath a Legal provision? What Injury is done to that *Tribe*, unless they be grieved that the *Episcopal Party* were not put to the Expence of Building a *New Meeting House*? These orderly People had access to *that Church* in an orderly way, by allowance and Authority of the *Good Town*, who only had Right to dispose of it, and now have Divine Offices performed there, where no Sermon has been these twenty eight years, since the Removal of Mr. *Hamilton*. And can any Man say, *That this is an invading upon, or invading the Rights and Properties of the two Presbyterian incumbents at Elgin*, who peaceably enjoy what they had before; And yet this *Vindicator* falsely insinuates it, as if these People had violently turned them out of Possession and usurped their *Rights and Properties*. You see this *Vindicator* is very Tragical upon slight occasions, and makes a huge noise for a thing of nothing. My Answer to his second Argument of Inconveniency has touch'd him so sensibly, that he hath altogether pass'd over it without any Reply, choosing rather to endure the present smart, than to encrease the pain, by struggling against it, *Pl. Deal.*

P. 11.

To the 3d. Letter, page 5. I answered fully *Plain Dealing* 11. That

Errours.

Errors, Miscarriages, Scandals, &c. and all kind of Wickedness do by their own Confession abound in this Land exceedingly and so were not imputable to a Toleration, but rather to the not allowing it; That since they got the Helm of Church Government in their Hands, many Congregations have for a long time wanted Watch-Men and Pastors to inspect and instruct them, and that even in Places where Popery prevails. That the Holy Communion which would keep People in a Religious awe of committing gross Abominations, is but rarely administered in many places, in some Congregation not for 8, or 9 years space, and in some, not at all, which may partly be occasioned by the known backwardness and aversion of the People to receive that *Holy Sacrament* from the hands of Presbyterian Preachers: upon Consideration of all which a *Toleration to Episcopal Ministers seems absolutely necessary*. But the *Vindicator* p. 25. never heeds, nor notices these Things to give them a discreet and solid Reply, but continues after his Old manner to clamour out and revile. We are encouragers of Vice, that such a Liberty granted to us would give a latitude to heinous Transgressors, and inevitably ruin all good Order, and then he discharges his fury most spitefully upon the *outed Curats*, as he calls them, and gives a Character of Us extremely ugly and extravagantly false, That *We would be a scandal to a society of Heathens, &c.* That *Popish Priests and Jesuits are not by far so bad, &c.* And having thus disgorg'd himself, he adds these remarkable words, *This is no Calumny, it is a necessary Truth, to hold forth the strength of the Argument*. You see, Sir, he trusts more to his Railing than to his Reason, to his Fury and Indignation, than to his Argument, *these Reproaches were necessary to hold forth the Strength of it.*

He knows well enough what is most taking with his Party, and Calumny is his greatest Talent. Now, to what Purpose are all these false and odious Reproaches Repeated over and over? is it, because we defend our own Cause to their great Vexation, and lay open the Folly and Vanity of their own Pretences? Can the *Presbyterian Cause* be maintained by no other Arts than these? Should not Reason be answered with Reason, and not with Calumnies and Reproaches, which bewray the Weakness of their Cause, and expose them to the Contempt of all Wise and Good Men? But *dignum patellæ operculum*.

I had said, *ibid.* There was no just Ground to fear, that Vice and Immoralities would encrease by granting a *Toleration*, while the Ministers are invested with Power to exercise Discipline, and the People willing to submit to their Censures; which may be reasonably concluded from the
Example

Example of the Episcopal Ministers, yet possessing their Churches, who never yet sought or needed the Assistance of the Secular Arm to curb the Irregularities of their People: The *Vindicator* replies to this. *ibid.* pag 25. *I must (saith he) in Charity doubt of it.* Doubt of it! and from a Principle of Charity too? O! rare and admirable Charity, which indisposes and hinders a Man to believe what is both good and acceptable. Sure this *Vindicator's* Charity is not a kin to St. Pauls, which believeth all things, hopeth all things. 1 Cor. 13. 7. But he adduces a Reason for this his singular Charity, but its *panno involuta*, hath a Rag about it, the Parishoners of his Parish (saith he) give Submission to the Kirk Session, and Obedience to the Censures of the Church; yet because the Appearances of some are Mock Appearances, and their Professions of Repentance, meerly feigned, they going on in their Sins, therefore the Minister and Session are obliged to address the Magistrate, that they may be restrained; and thence he infers, That a greater Accusation can hardly be advanced against Prelatical Ministers possessing their Churches, than I give in against them. To be sure, out of the tender Respect he hath to the Reputation of these Prelatical Ministers, he'll not suffer me to go without a Check, for affirming such an ill thing of them, that they neither needed nor sought the Assistance of the Secular Arm to curb the Irregularities of their people. I thought it had been their Glory, and not Dishonour, and a Mark of the Blessing of GOD upon their Labours, that it is so; and in true Christian Charity I believe so yet, tho his Charity obligeth him to think the contrary. Philosophers advise Us to be slow and wary in drawing Consequences, yet it seems they have lost all their pains upon this rash and precipitate *Vindicator*, It is not so in his Paroch, therefore it is not so in theirs; is such an Argument conclusive and solid? Do not Vices prevail and abound more in some places than others? Are not the Tempers of some people more ductile and malleable than these of others? and are not many People lyable and exposed to Tentations and Occasions of sins of several kinds, to which others are not. And is not the LORD's Supper more frequently Administrat by some than by others, which keeps people in a Religious awe of Returning to the Commission of those sins, which they have so lately and solemnly Renounced? And because its thus and thus in such a place, doth it necessarily follow it must be so in all others too? 'Tis inconsequential and absurd to assert it. But I waste too much time, and fill up too much Room in pursuing all his vain and frivolous Exceptions. In short, this present Dispute is about Matter of Fact, and since he gain-

says what I have said before, let him produce his Instances to the contrary.

To his fourth Argument, *Letter* page 6. I answered *Plain Dealing* page 12. First, *That it struck against all Liberty to any Dissenters for publick Worship, and therefore if allowed, would prove more than he designed or desired, and withal, that it was as good and valid against the Presbyterians formerly, as against Us now, and yet they were Tolerated and indulged.* Instead of giving a solid and direct Answer to this, this *Vindicator*, page 26. digresseth and runs away from my Argument to his *Caves, Woods, Mountains, Grass-Merkat, Cross of Edinburgh, &c.* leaving it to abide in its Strength. And for all his Clamour 'tis as clear as the Sun, *they were indulged and tolerated.* As for Persecution, I am as much an Enemy to it as any other in the World, but since Conscience may be pretended, when Faction and Sedition are intended, the State may be left to judge for it self, in all things relating to its own preservation, and reasonably put in Execution the Laws made to prevent such Confusions in Church and State, as must needs follow, where Giddiness, Phanaticism, and Rebellious Practices prevail. The Presbyterians were never required to condemn or deny any thing they judged Truth, but to live in Peace and Subjection to the State, but they would needs resist, and go to Fields to fight for the Good Old Cause, the Holy Covenant, so that I conclude as I said in my first Paper, *That the Government never stretcht out its hand against them, untill first they lifted up the Heel against it.* And for this I appeal to the True Narrative of the proceedings of his Majesty's Privy Council in Scotland, for the securing the Peace of that Kingdom in the Year 1678. And Sir George M'kenzie's *Vindication of the late Reigns of King Charles the 2d, and King James the 7th.* And a particular Account of this matter may afterwards be given from Authentick Records.

In my second Answer, I Affirm'd that no Tract of Time was like to Raze out of the Minds of Knowing Conscientious Persons, a Perswasion so well Grounded, as that of Episcopacy is; Nor that Parents and others would be wanting to instruct and Breed up their Children, and those in whom they are concerned in there own Principles and Perswasion. To this he Replys, p. 26. *It is a fair Advertisement given to the Kirk, to take Nottice of such as instruct the Youth, and hopeth they will do it.* And who doubts but they are as Zealous to root out Episcopacy, as Julian the Apostate was to Extirpate Christianity; for such is their rooted Hatred against our Persons and Principles, that whereas they
are

are not able to Confute Us by Argument, they Labour to Crush Us by Force or Unjustifiable Artifices. But Our Defence is of God, who saveth the Upright in Heart, Our Help is in the Name of the Lord, who made Heaven and Earth; The Remainder of Wrath he will Restrain, and bring to Nought their Evil Devices.

To this purpose he adds, *ibid.* That such Parents and Masters of Families are so few, that I would be ashamed to produce a List of them; and to confirm this, he tells an arrant and palpable untruth, (and I find by many instances in his pamphlet, that 'tis his culpable Infirmary that he is too apt to believe and publish a lie,) for he saith, he is afraid I should be tempted to put down one and the same person 7 or 8 times under different designations, as my Friends in Fife were, in making up their Address. I have narrowly inquired into this Story, and discovered the falshood of it, and the mistake that gave rise to it; and if the *Vindicator* or any Man else will prove that any person in Fife Subscribed the principal Address more than once, or in carrying it on, Subscribed under different Designations, *erit mihi magnus Apollo*, there is nothing so treacherous or false a Man sooner then a Transient Report; and 'tis a shame for a Man to be often taken tardy, telling untruths.

To his Fifth, p. 27. *If a Toleration be still pressed, the Introduction of Prelacy is necessarily intended.* To this I answered, *Pl. Deal*, p. 12. That this was the product of his jealousy and unreasonable suspicion: That never Man thought, that the *Tolerating a Perswasion* in any Nation, necessarily inferred the Legal Establishment of the same. For the proof of this, I adduced the practice of England, Holland, nay of France it self in King Henry the 4ths. Time, his grant of the ample *Edict of Nantz*: which Liberty to Protestants in a vast Popish Kingdom, I said, might shame our Presbyterians that will by no means consent to a *Toleration* to their fellow Subjects of the same *Reformed Religion* with themselves; and let the Reader judge whether this be Sense. Now what Reply makes the *Vindicator* to this? Nothing but Scolding. p. 27. *It's a Ramble*, saith he, *from England to Holland, from Holland to France, its purely excentrick, for my part I cannot Extract one grain of sense out of it.* This is all the Reply; does such pitiful stuff as this deserve a serious Answer? If he has no more to do but stoutly to call that nonsense; or not to the purpose, which he cannot Answer, as he usually doth, when he is hard pressed, at this Rate of Talking he is able to confute the clearest Demonstrations, and no wise Man should medle with such a
whiffle

whiffle in contraversion. But to proceed, I answered the Reason offered, *Ibid*, for his imagined connexion betwixt a *Toleration* and the *Legal Establishment of Prelacy*, *Pl. Deal* p. 13. and proved, that our submitting to our Bishops to whom we owe Canonical Obedience did not infer any such thing; for as the Case stands now, we do own and submit to them, yet are they not legally established, which I sadly Regret; so that these are two very different things, and altogether separable: Nor did it infer (as I humbly conceive) a manifest incroachment upon the *Claim of Right*; for as I argued there, the *Claim of Right* with what followed thereupon, has only deprived our Bishops, of the protection of the State, of their Secular Encouragements, Priviledges and Revenues, but has not divested them of their *Spiritual Powers* as *Christian Bishops* derived to them from *Christ* and his Church, and which the *Primitive Bishops* exercised, when they had not the protection and Countenance of the *Secular Powers*. And I hope this will appear very reasonable to any sober considering Person; for if our Bishops had been, *Desecrat* and turned out of their *Holy Orders* and *Spiritual Powers*, as they were out of their External Advantages, then, upon Supposition, that they were Restored here, or to be Advanced to *Episcopal see's* else where, they behooved of Necessity to be *Consecrate a New*; a thing never practised in the *Christian Church*. And (which comes close home to my Adversary) Let me suppose, that *Presbytry* were Declared a *Grievance*, and all the Present Preachers laid aside by *Act of Parliament*, would the *Vindicator* acknowledge that, *ipso facto*, they lost the *Spiritual Powers* of *Presbyters*, and were to be reckoned thenceforth but meer *Laicks*? I suppose this he will not grant in his own case, and therefore it is partial and Disingenuous to deny it in ours. To all this he returns no other Reply page 27. but Wrath, Fury and Indignation against my Person, for venturing to Reason about the *Claim of Right*, tho I have done it in that Paper, with all the Modesty and humble Submission to the *Civil Powers*, that possibly I could, and was led into the Discourse by his own Argument. He hath taken Sanctuary under a *Law*, hoping I should never pursue him thither; but because I have done it, with all due Respect both to the *Law*, and *Law Makers*; therefore as Men in danger call for assistance, so he excites the Governours to avenge his Quarrel; *If I pass*, saith he, *without challenge and censure*, others may deal more boldly with it, & again, it is a *Disgrace* to our Nation & a manifest *Reproach* to Authority, not to evidence so much Strength and Resolution, as to check such Insolent Arrogancy, as this *Pl. Deal*; and his fellows

law are guilty of. And then he claps and crows, he has got the Victory. If this be the way to answer our Arguments, we must let these Men say what they list.

The only reasonable thing I find in his *Pamphlet* is what followeth, page 28. A proposal to which I heartily agree, *Let these* (saith he) *who have not a Mind to be deceived, consider the said Letter and compare it, and what is here said, with the Plain Dealing; And I am of Opinion, Tergiversation and downright Juggling, instead of Plain Dealing, on the one side or other, shall easily be discovered.* And I am exactly of the same mind with him; And I beg the Debate betwixt us may be determined by the same measure, that his Letter, with the Vindication of it, and my *Plain Dealing*, with this *Defence* of it, may exactly be compared together, and then let the *Impartial World* judge, whether of Us two maintains our Ground best; and shews most Candour in these paper Combats; and who seeks to avoid the Disreputation of losing it, by base and unworthy Arts.

Ibid. He saith, *He hath abundantly manifested the Discrepancy betwixt our Case and that of the English Dissenters,* as if what he dogmatiz'd on this head in his Letter had been self evident Propositions; whereas he Replies nothing here to what I justly advanced against it in the *Plain Dealing* page 13, for that brought upon the Theatre again the *sinful Terms* required of Us by the Presbyterians, and that was too hot for him to handle, *Burnt Children dread the Fire.* But he takes notice of an Expression charged upon one of his old predecessors in time of the shedding the Blood of Loyalists on Scaffolds, *the Work goes bonnily on,* this he calls a *Calumny*; but it is as true as the other spoken by the same Man, *shame them and berry them,* against which he doth not except, and both Expressions are upon Record. As for his Recrimination, *That the Prelatical Minister at Jedburgh exhorted the Lords of Justiciary, being there in Circuit, to make their Scarlet Robes yet more red in the Blood of Phanaticks,* and then adds, *Let no Man doubt of the Truth of this, for I shall prove it, if I be put to it.* If this *Vindicator* would, but now and then at least, express so much Ingenuity, as his Brother the Pockmanty Preacher did in prefacing his Story, *Now, saith he, I'll tell you a Tale, I dare not say it is true, but ye shall have it as I have it,* he might perhaps in progress of time, become a Story Writer of some Credit; But there is small hope of this, for to *columniate boldly* is his way. What that Reverend and worthy Minister said, was no more but this, as your *scarlet Robes*, said he, speaking

I

to these

to these Lords, *put you in mind to do Justice upon Criminals, so the Ermitte,* with which they are lyned, may mind you to mix Mercy with Justice. A piece of Oratory well becoming that grave and good Man, pleasant to the Hearers, and pertinent to the purpose, for which it was designed, which was the *Mitigation* and not the *Execution* of the Rigour of the Law. And if the Phanatics, to whom alone this Man applyes this Speech, were the only Criminal Offenders in these Bounds, they were a goodly pack indeed. And here I desire the Reader to advert, that page 21 of his *Vindication* he saith these words. *To say Prelatists have met with severe proceedings from Presbyterians these bygone years, upon the Account of their perswasion, is a notorious falshood;* yet here when he hath a fair Opportunity of purging and clearing his Party of that Charge (I having spent more than half a page, *Plain Dealing* page 15, upon an Enumeration of the several kinds of Severities exercised towards us, meerly upon the Account of our Perswasion) he does not in the least attempt it, as knowing it impossible to be done. Wonderful impudence!

Ibid, I had said, *Pl. Deal*, page 15, That if their fear be real, and not palliat and disguis'd, that a Toleration will, at long Run, justle them out of their Churches and Benefices, then it is manifest, they themselves never believ'd that the generality of the Nation was for them; but only thought it their Interest to have it so declared and believed by others, &c. To this the *Vindicator* Replys, page 28. they do not oppose a Toleration on that score, but because in their Judgement, it would pave the way to Prelacy, and so to Popery, and when King James had framed a design of reducing this poor Land to the Obedience of the Pope, a Toleration was judg'd a Notable expedient. Do they, indeed, in their Judgement think so? are they perswaded in their Conscience, that Prelacie paves the way to Popery? I take it rather to be prejudice than Judgement, and we say, *prejudicium tollit Judicium*. How have they discoursed themselves into this practical Judgement, so as to oppose a Toleration to Prelatical Ministers for fear of Popery? What is the Light and Evidence that directs their Minds in passing such a Judgement? It would appear it proceeded rather from the darkness than the clearness of their Understandings, else they would not act so maliciously against palpable Evidences to the contrary: such as the Episcopal Church in our Neighbouring Nation, which hath withstood all the shocks and attempts of the *Romish See*, and is an impregnable Bulwark against Popery: yea our own behaviour in King James's Reign is sufficient to confute this unreasonable pretence, who

with

with Zeal and Courage, Preached against the *Errors of the Church of Rome*, and the danger of their spreading and prevailing in this Land. Whilst in the meantime the *Presbyterian Brethren* were altogether silent as to this Matter, and accepted the *Toleration*, which, this *Vindicator* acknowledges, was judged a *Notable Expedient* for throughing King James's design of Reducing this Land to the Obedience of the Pope of Rome, which also he own'd once before, page 15. And the more unworthy they, that knew so much, and yet accepted it, so that upon the whole, they are the Men, that are likelier to pave the way for Popery, than we of the Episcopal Clergy.

To this purpose we have the Testimony of a Virulent Adversary, the Author of that pestilent Pamphlet, *the Hynd let loose*, who tells us that the Curats, for so he Nick Names the Episcopal Clergy, opposed the Repealing of the Penal Statutes, that the Man of Sin, the Popish Hierarchy might not again take deep Rooting in the Land; when among the Presbyterians, from whom a great Opposition was expected, there was a profound Silence, yea, saith he, they were busie Hammering an Address of Thanks for that Indulgence granted to them and the Papists, contrary to Law. And, he infers, that since in that Proclamation it is declared, that this Common Favour flowed from the unaccountable Principle of Absolute dispensing Power, the Acceptation of it imported a Recognizance of the Claim of the Grantor, and consequently the Accepters were guilty of betraying our Liberties and Laws, and of putting on the Livery of the Beast.

What is said, *Plain Dealing*, page 16. That King Charles his Indulgence and King James's Toleration were granted to the Presbyterians on very easie Terms, without any Oaths, is undeniable Matter of Fact; That King James his Toleration extended to every Town and Parish throughout the Kingdom, is certain also, That the Presbyterian Ministers turned out by Law, after the Restoration, were few in Number, in comparison to the Episcopal Clergy who were turned out by the Rabble, and otherways since this Revolution, is equally true with the other two: And therefore it is reasonable that the Liberty granted to Us should be the more extensive. What Ground then for his Complaint of unfair Dealing, pag. 29? And whereas he says, there was none of them but would have owned the Civil Government, and prayed expressly for the King. Does not he, yea, the whole Nation know that many of them, Preachers as well as People, disown'd the King's Title and Authority, and would not Redeem their Lives at the just and easie

casie Rate of saying GOD save him? And 'tis well known they declaimed against their Brethren's Acceptance of an *Indulgence*, as an *Apollacie* and *Sinful Defection from the Cause of GOD*, a notable Breach of their solemn *League and Covenant*, and wrote most bitterly against them, calling them *Council Curates*.

In his next, page 29. He quarrels that I call his Representation of the Hardships they underwent *Calumnious* and *Unreasonable*. It was the Printers Inadvertence, the Word in my paper was *clamorous*, and now I call it *Clamorous*, *Calumnious* and *Unreasonable*. He talks too much of their Sufferings under *Prelacy*, both to his own and's Parties Disgrace: For it brings into Remembrance the gross and unaccountable Faults, Rigours, and Cruelties of *their predecessors*, in imposing their Covenants, even against the Will and Consent of the *King*; and *Inclinations* of the People; as also the *Seditious* and *Rebellious* practices of that surviving party in the late Reigns, and their unrelenting posterity. Did they not force all Men to take their *Solemn League*, obliging Man, Wife and Children come to Age, to swear it in the *publick Congregations* thorow out the *Kingdom*, with uplifted hands? Did they not severely punish such as refused it? and cruelly persecute to death those that oppos'd it? And whereas their *Preachers* should have withstood these bloody Severities, they not only countenanced them, but drove them on, and never yet condemned these wicked practices.

And to such an hight of Insolence they arrived, that in the year 1648, the *Kirk* did Countermand the *State*, in the Matter of *paying Taxes* and *Levying an Army* for Rescuing the *King*; which *Engagement* of the *State* the *Kirk* most unlawfully called an *unlawful Engagement*; and barred the *Nobility* and *Gentry* from their Priviledges and Rights, till they were satisfied. Did not their *General Assemblies* make Laws for owning their *Covenants and Cause*, and holding *Communion* with them, under the most grievous penalties, *Excommunication* and *Forfeiture* following thereupon; which they never failed to put to vigorous Execution, where Obedience was not given? Nay if any will bear the pains to Trace the Behaviour and Practices of the *Presbyterian Zialots* in *Scotland*, since the short time they appeared on the Stage of the World untill this very day, It will be found they have been the *Scaurges* of *Monarchy*, the *Pest* and *bane* of *civil Society*, and *greatest Persecutors* that were ever seen among *Christians* of the *Reformed Religion*. And seing *King Charles the 2d.* found that by means of *them* and the *Covenants*, his *Royal Father* was murdered,
himself

himself exiled and banished from his Inheritance, his best Subjects and Friends either put to Death or Beggary, and the whole Kingdom brought under Thralldom and Misery. Was it not most necessary, just, and reasonable, That the King and Parliament being deeply sensible of these horrid Crimes, and most afflictive evils under which the Nation had groaned for many years, should put a stop to, and prevent for the future, such execrable Villanies, by removing the Original, Source and byterians entered, under pretence of Reformation. It was just and necessary, I say, to strike at the Root of these evils, and to extirpate, if possible, such Rebellious Principles: and this was all they did, to discharge the Obligatory Force of the League and Covenant, to rise in Arms against the King, &c. and the renewing thereof. See Act 7 Par. 1st. K. Ch. 2d. and Act 6. Parl. 3. K. Ch. 2d. So that this Vindicator goes indeed beyond the Bounds of Truth and Reason, when he calls the Renouncing of these bloody Bonds, a Force upon their Consciences, and the deserved punishments of their Covenanted Rebellions and Insurrections in the Year 1666, and afterwards, &c. Persecutions and unjust Sufferings. They were not irritated and provoked by the Government, to seditious Practices, and Schismatical Separation; the People were required to do nothing, but live peaceably and join in Worship: Whereas the Presbyterians were wont to make the People swear to their Cause, particularly at the first Receiving of the Sacrament of the LORD's Supper, according to the Act Assen. 1648, August 7. And their Ministers were not required to maintain Prelacy, and to Renounce and root out Presbytrism; but only to give Submission to Episcopacy, and concur in Discipline, which in Conscience they ought to have done, there being nothing professed and performed in our Church contrary to the Word of GOD, as hath been acknowledged by the Vindicator in his Letter page 3. They had a fair Offer of their Churches, and a competent time allowed them to consider on it, without any Rabbling or Rigour exercised towards them, and what more could the State do for them? Yes, more might have been done, the Vindicator will say, Presbytrie might have been preserved in its Vigor; that is in plain Scots, the King and Parliament should have protected by their Authority, what the Covenanters set up by Rebellion, and hugg the Vipers: And is not that a very moderate and reasonable Demand? And tho the Vindicator p. 30. Disowns the Declarations of Sanguhar, Lanark, Queensferry, &c. and asks, were they approved by Presbyterians? yet

ans? yet all this is but meer juggle; for the Authors of those Declarations are the very Men of his Party, who, he exclaims, were forced to flee to *Caves, Woods, Mountains*, were persecuted by Soldiers, and brought to the *Grafs-Mercat and Cross of Edinburgh*. He owns them when they suffer, but disowns them when they are charged with and convicted of the faults for which they suffer. And for Answer to his Question, I'll put another to him; did his Brethren ever by any publick deed disown and condemn the foresaid Declarations? No surely: 'Tis true in their address of Thanks to the late *King James*, they seemingly disown such as did promote any disloyal Principles and Practices, and desire that they may be looked upon as none of theirs, whatsoever Name they assume to themselves. But then it is also true, that how soon the Scene is changed, and *King James Abdicated*, they own these disloyal People as Confessors and Martyrs of their Communion, and receive the most guilty among them into their Society, even him who in the *Hynd* let loose justified the Murder of the Royal Martyr, and all this, without making him or them disown or recant their disloyal principles and practices.

Plain Dealing p. 17. To his first Argument, why we ought in Conscience to join with the present Presbyterians, taken from our former Doctrine of no separation upon account of Forms of Government, I gave a full Answer; That we alwise understood it of a Church duly constituted, as ours was at that time; of a Church that required no sinful Terms of Communion; of a Church that was not Schismatical; none of all which can be truly affirmed of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. And whatever may be said and granted as to Communion with other Churches of Presbyterian Constitution, the like cannot be said of our Scottish Presbyterians, who differ from them in all these three Respects, as is already proved. To this I added, that it was impudent and unreasonable for them to expect or require, that we should grant to them now, what their Predecessors the Protestants would not formerly have yielded to their Brethren the publick Resolutioners, and what they themselves, before the late Revolution, would not grant to the then Established Episcopal Church, which had a better Title to their Submission and Concurrence in Doctrine, Worship and Discipline, than they can pretend to at this day, with Respect to us. One would have thought that a formal and solid Reply should have been made to all this; but instead of that, nothing but bare assertions in a few Lines, p. 31. *It is* (saith he) *to tell the Presbyterians, and that in the Name of GOD, and from his Word, That the Communion of the Church* should

should not be broken, either because of Prelacy or Presbytry: if this doth not make against them, nothing can. And again, The bold and incoherent discourse that followeth, saith he, is meerly to deceive the Reader and to make him forget the Argument; but not to furnish him with the least solution to it. But how comes in his Presbytrie? just as the Man brought Hercules into his Sermon, by head and shoulders: his Presbytry was no part of our Doctrine, nor had we it in our view. And what is there in this Reply that doth in the least make for it, or overthrow the sense of our Church about our Doctrine of No Separation, upon the Account of forms of Government? or what brings he to wipe off the forecited Objections against our present Scottish Presbytry, why it neither was, nor could be, understood by us in that point? or what Reason gives he to enforce his Argument, that we ought to join in Communion with them, notwithstanding of all that I have pleaded to the contrary? I see none but this; he will have it so, and it must needs be so; is not this a doughty Vindicator?

To his second Argument, That we hold the Government of the Church to be ambulatory; I answered *Pl. Deal.* p. 18. 'twas affirmed without ground or proof: and proved the contrary from the Writings of our own Clergy, as also from the sacred Books of the New Testament, where we find our Blessed LORD instituted an Imparity among Church-Men, which being never repealed, was designed to continue to the end of the World: whereof, the practice of the Apostles, and of the Catholick Church immediately from the Apostles Times, is a strong confirmation. And so strong it is, (as I proved there) that what is said by the Presbyterians against the continuance of this Imparity, as being a thing extraordinary, only designed to continue for a time, and not by succession in all Ages, doth strike as forcibly against the continuance of a standing Ministry: For Quakers and other Sectaries use this very Argument of the Presbyterians to that purpose. The Vindicator thought it not fit so much as to mention these Reasonings of mine, they being too hard and knotty for him, and I commend him for that piece of Mother-wit.

As for Dr. Stillingfleets Judgement in this Matter, and what concerned his *Irenicum*, I gave a full and satisfactory Account to all Considering and Impartial Men. *Pl. Deal.* p. 19. But how is it possible to satisfy this Vindicator, who, without confuting any thing I said there, is still resolved to contradict and cavill? as he doth page 31.

Neither doth the Vindicator take notice of any of my Answers made

to his foolish pretence, that by the *Test*, we are obliged to submit to *Presbytrie* now established; which Nonsensical Whimsie, tho' it deserved to be hooted at, and entertained with Scorn, yet I bestowed a large Confutation on it, as the Reader may see. *Pl. Det.* page 19. 20. To which he makes no Reply, more than he had never seen it, and consequently it holds good, and remains in its force. But instead of Vindicating, he repeats what he said in his *Admired Letter*, his *indefectible, infallible, self-evident Text*, which, he thinks, needs no Proof or Confirmation. The Law, no where that I have read expressly asserts it, to be the *Inherent Right of the Crown* to alter and change the *External Government of the Church*, but only to *Order and Dispose* it, and whether this be the very same with the other is dubious and under Debate. Tho' in the mean time, I grant, the *King* with Advice and Consent of *Parliament* may give the Legal Establishment, Countenance and Protection of the State to any Government they please. And no wonder that King *Charles 2d.* by his *Prerogative Royal* turned out *Presbytrie*, which having set it self up by *Rebellion*, had been instrumental of turning himself out of his *Dominions*, and his *Royal Father* out of his *Throne* and his *Life* too. And tho' he had turned *Prelacy* to *Presbytrie*, all that we were bound to in that Case, by the *Test*, was to submit patiently to his *Royal pleasure*, but not to own the *New set up Model*, to be the *True Government of the Church of CHRIST*; Sure we are, in this Sense it was Administred, in this Sense we took it, and not in two contrary meanings.

In the Papers that have passed betwixt Us and the Presbyterians these few Months bygone, we have been necessitated by the Thread of Discourse, and their own Clamours about their Sufferings, modestly to represent their Faults, as the procuring Causes of them, which they are neither willing to remember nor amend: And this, like all guilty persons, they call *Railing and Bitterness*. And we are reputed *Enemies*, because we tell them the Truth. 'Tis a sign the Disease is desperate, when the Patient cannot endure to be touch'd. And thus the *Indicator* deals with my self and Brethren, for he says page 31. *That Railing is the only Argument we have against them*; And if this be true, he never spoke an Untruth in his Lifetime, nor any Man else. You have another like unto it, in the very next Sentence. *May not a Man*, (saith he) *charge some of the Episcopal persuasion, as Enemies to the Civil Government, without Railing?* And yet in his *Letter* pag. 10. he charged not only some, but all, with Disaffection to it, his Words are these, *It is manifest, the Generality of those*
of that

of that way, if not the whole of them, are disaffected with the Civil Establishment, and have been and still are Enemies to the late happy Revolution. To prove that we are Rebellious Men, have done and would do ill things against the Government, had we a probability of Success, he adduces the instance of the late Lord Dundee, with the Men under his conduct; at which he makes a horrible noise, musters his Arguments, draws them out in Rank and File, and makes Charge upon Charge against Us; Did we not lead out multitudes of Armed Men to the Fields, blow the Trumpet of Rebellion, emit Declarations, assert nullity of Titles, Discharge payment of Taxes, &c. What a pity is it, that this Man hath never the luck to stumble on some good medium, or Argument, he sets this off so prettily? but does not all Men know, That this was an extraordinary Effort, upon an extraordinary occasion? sudden Revolutions are puzzling and surprizing. When Dundee took the Fields, the then Prince of Orange was not declared King of Scotland, the Crown was neither offered to him nor accepted by him? And since the Lord Dundee and his adherents had not transferred their Allegiance from their Native Prince to another, none being come into his Room, they Judged it a Commanded Duty to appear for him. If my Kingdom, saith our Saviour, were of this World, then would my Servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, John 18. 36, where our Lord supposes it was a common Duty, that Subjects should fight to prevent the Captivity of their King. But what is all this to us, who have done none of these things; but both then and ever since, have lived peaceably, payed Taxes, Poll, Hearth Money, &c. This Man casts iniquity upon Us, and in wrath hates Us.

The *Vindicators* Intersifies, p. 32. from what I answered to his Allegations about our concern and praying for the King, Queen Dowager, &c. are so very absurd, that he may appear, even to himself, a very Ridiculous and malicious Calumpniator. They are all Cousin Germans to *Baculus est in angulo; ergo pluit*, and Minister Matter to any Man to flatter and Mock at them, and are unworthy of any Man's regard. I gave a full Answer to these Accusations led against Us, *Pl. Deal.* p. 20. And thereunto I refer the Reader. Is it not Ridiculous that he should charge Us for Praying so and so, in private and in publick, which he was bound to make good, and then tell me, I was bound to clear myself, and intimates of that heavy Charge, that we do not so? whereas I know not, perhaps, one of an Hundred of the Episcopal Perswasion, far less am I conversant with them. Again, because I said, they pray not so explicitly in their Meeting Houses, thence he infers, I acknowledge, they pray so implicitly.

citely, as if, forsooth, I were privy to Men's inmost thoughts; is not this notably argued? But too much of this falsom stuff.

Next he makes a long stride, and cleverly steps over a page and an half of *Pl. Deal.* without any other Reply, but a Reference to the *infallible Oracle*, his *Letter* page 33. The Matter he thought came too close home, was nettling and pungent, and therefore judged it safest to keep his hands free of it. But this is not the first of my Arguments, he has taken on at Interest.

To make me amends for this, he Misrepresents my Argument, *Pl. Deal.* p. 22 or rather substitutes his own words in place of it, the sum, saith he, of all the *Plain Dealer* says, amounts to this, that tho the *States Declaired Prelacy to be an insupportable grievance to the Nation; yet the Prelatists, in calling Prelatical Government Apostolical in their Address, do not arraign the Claim of Right, nor yet declare that, which is the Queens Title to the Crown, Unchristian.* This, you see is no Argument at all, but a bare assertion, a downright begging of the Question, whereas my Argument and express words are these, *Plain Dealing* page 22, paragraph 3, And for all his *Thundring and furious Bluster, our calling the Government of the Church by Bishops, truly ancient and Apostolical, can never be supposed to infer our arraigning the Claim of Right, or her Majesty's Title to the Crown, as Unchristian; unless this Adversary say, That the Estates, in declaring Episcopacy to be an insupportable Grievance to the Nation, declared it, ipso facto, to be also Unchristian; And I humbly conceive, they will not own that they meant any such thing.* This Argument I hope will appear to every considering Man, solid and conclusive, except to this weak and prejudicat *Vindicator*; who, it seems, believes that Episcopacy is in it self *Unchristian*, or that a Declaration hath made it such. It had been more for his Credit to have waved this Argument, as he has done many others, then use such disingenuous Juggling.

By an Induction of many particulars, specifically distinguishing the *Presbyterians* from the Body of the *Nation*, I clearly proved that these men who committed such and such Deeds, and their Unrelenting Posterity are the only Party in the Kingdom, whom we charge as partakers of the *Murder of that Royal Martyr K: CH. 1st.* and not the whole Nation: see *plain Dealing* penult pag. But this *Vindicator* would fain thrust himself into good Company, that he might shelter himself and his guilty friends under the shadow of *Loyal Subjects*: And therefore in the same pag. 33. he loads the whole *Nation* with that most foul and detestable fact; *Its plain,*

saith

saith he, these deeds, which he reckons accessory, were National deeds, and therefore he but juggles in attributing them to a certain party. Do not you see, that 'tis the *Vindicator* and his Associates that most unaturally and calumniously load their Native Country with the horrid Murder of King CH. 1st. All the Deeds reckoned accessory were National Deeds, saith he, and then he subjoins, We will not own, and it can never be proven, that Presbyterians, far less that Presbyterian Ministers, were accessory to the taking away of the Kings Life.

Now, that Presbyterians, and more especially Presbyterian Ministers were heinously accessory to this horrid Crime, I shall make as clear and evident as a Sun beam, from the publick Records of their own Kirk. He would not answer my Question *Plain Dealing* pag. penult. who and of what Party they were that committed such and such Deeds against the King, and now I shall do it for him. In doing whereof I shall give a short Narrative of their Proceedings against the K. for eight years space, from 1643 to 1650 inclusively, in which time, I think, all Men will acknowledge, that the Presbyterians were the domineering and prevailing Party both in Church and State.

In the year 1643, The Parliament of England being in Arms against the King, send Commissioners to the Convention of Estates and General Assembly, to desire a near and strick Union to be entered into by the two Kingdoms, and a considerable Force of Horse and Foot for their Assistance against the King and his Army, the Papists, Prelatists, and Malignants, as they call them. Their Paper with the Propositions contained in it, was presented to the Convention August 12, and to the Assembly August 15 1643. And there 'tis said they received the abovementioned Desires with most sensible Affections. They speedily grant their Desire, and Enter into a Solemn League with them, and send them Forces, with a Presbytrie of Ministers to pray for their Success. See Act. Gen. Assemb. August 17 1643.

In the Year 1644. The Presbytrie with the Army in England against the King, writ from Middlethorp, May 20. to the General Assembly met at Edinburgh, Thursday the 30 of May 1644, wherein they give an Account of their Expedition, That the Kings Army was much diminished in the number thereof, and begs the Assembly to help forward the work with all their might. And indeed their Reverences were not slack, for June 3. they make an Act for sending a fresh Recruit of Ministers, to relieve those attending the Army, and take course to strengthen it. And whereas the Presbytrie in their Letter had said, The City of York was blocked up, wherein a swarm

of *obdurate Papists*. (that is, such as fought against the Covenanters, for all such were called Papists) The *Assembly* was thus encouraging him, *That Sanctuary, which your Enemies, and the Enemies of your God, have taken, shall not save them.*

In the Year 1645. Whereas, by the Solemn League June 1643. Such as would not take the Covenant, or withstood it, were declared to be *publick Enemies to their Religion and Country, and to be punished as professed Adversaries and Malignants.* The Loyal Subjects, seeing the Kings Authority contemned and his power weakened, did in Duty take Arms for his Assistance. Upon this the General Assembly at Edinburgh February 7th. 1645. present a Petition to the *Parliament*, exhorting them, to put in execution all Lawful and possible ways of speedy and active pursuing and extirpating the Enemies of GOD and his Cause, (as they mistook them) within the Kingdom, and the Assembly, for its own part, would proceed against them with the Censures of the Kirk. After this, February 12. The Assembly Emit a Solemn warning to the Noblemen, Barons, Gentlemen, Burrows, Ministers and Commons of Scotland, and to their Armies without and within the Kingdom, ordaining it to be Read on a LORD's Day after Sermon; It is mighty large, and in it all imaginable Methods are laid down for diminishing the King's Forces, and destroying his best Friends: and all of high and low Degree are exhorted to mind their Covenants, to pay their Tolls, and Taxes and Publick Burdens for Conscience sake, that the Enemy, (that is the King with his Army) who, say they, had displayed a Banner against the LORD and against his CHRIST, might be suppressed, which could not be done, without a competent number of Forces, nor they kept together without Maintainance, nor Maintainance had without publick Burdens, &c.

Next day, Feb. 13. 1645, they draw a Remonstrance to His Majesty, wherein they acquaint him with the foresaid Warning, and the danger he was in, if he did not stoop to their Lure, and gratifie their Brethren in England with the Abolition of Episcopacy, tho it was against his Conscience and Coronation Oath. In that Paper, they most saucily and presumptuously tell him, his Peoples Patience is above measure tempted, and is like a Cart prest down with Sheaves, &c. then they Load him with all the guilt and Crimes committed in his Dominions, and require him to fall down and let the Son of GOD Reign over him and his Kingdoms, in his pure Ordinances and Worship: That is, let him submit himself to Presbytry, for in their Opinion, our Blessed LORD Reigneth no where, but where they Command, as his Office-Bearers. If this he refuse to do, then

then they threaten him with the sad consequences that will follow ; And tell him plainly, they are not diffident of the success of the Cause and Covenant of the three Kingdoms, that they'll pursue and promote it to the outmost, and that zealously and constantly with their Estates and Lives.

In the year 1646 June 17. The Assembly, as they had formerly Excommunicated the Noble Marquess of Montrose his Majesty's Lieutenant General and Vice-Roy, so they ordain all within the Kingdom of high or low Degree that had assisted, or any ways complied with him to be Censured, by acknowledging their Offence upon their knees, first before the Presbytry, and then before the Congregation, suspending them in the mean time from the LORD's Supper, and if they did not satisfie in the foresaid manner, to be Excommunicated, as they summarily dealt with the Earl of Seaforth June 13. 1646. And in another Act the said day. they ordain such as had been instruments of publishing the Noble Marquesses Proclamation for indicating a Parliament, which, say they, *We find to be full of Blasphemies against the Solemn League and Covenant of the three Kingdoms, to be punished with the highest censures of the Kirk, besides their Exemplary civil punishment, which they Recommend to be inflicted by the Committee of Estates.* And then June 18. 1646, They write a Congratulatory Letter to the English Parl. telling them, it was a Matter of great refreshment to them, that the Enemy, that is, the King and his Army, had fallen every where before them, assuring them of their constancy to the Solemn League, and exhorting them to the same steadfastness.

In the year 1647. August 20. They send a Brotherly Exhortation to their Brethren in England, that they may give a Testimony, as they word it, to the Truth of God and to the Kingdom of his Son Jesus Christ, now so much resisted and opposed. And beseech them as Christs Ambassadors to put the two Houses of Parliament and all that have taken the Covenant in mind, that they suffer not themselves directly nor indirectly to be withdrawn from it to any sinful Compliance or making Peace, till Presbytry be settled and Prelacy abolished.

In the year 1648. The King being delivered up into the hands of his Rebellious Subjects in England, by direction and consent of the Kirk ; (For all this time neither the State nor Army did any thing without their Advice and Consent) he was treated as a Prisoner, carried from place to place, and at last to Carisbrook Castle in the Isle of Wight. The Estates of Parl: being deeply touched with this Barbarous usage of their Native Prince Resolve upon delivering him, and pass an Act, June 10.

1648, for that effect, with a Declaration to the *Parl.* and Kingdom of *England*, concerning that important Affair. The Committee of *E.* states publish an Act June 12 1648, whereby all Subjects are ordained by Subscription to acknowledge the said Act and Declaration of *Parliament*, as just, and to oblige themselves to adhere thereunto. The *Kirk* violently opposeth this, and the *General Assembly* meet at *Edinburgh*, July 12 1648. The Committee sends them first one Paper July 17. and thereafter another July 24, both to the purpose and Effect foresaid. In Answer whereunto the *Assembly* July 25. Declare, That there is no possibility of securing Religion, if this Engagement be carried on. That the King's Concessions were unsatisfactory; and that before he were restored to the Exercise of his Royal Power, he must give Assurance, by his Solemn Oath under his hand and Great Seal, to settle Religion, according to the Solemn League within his three Kingdoms: And then July 28, They make an Act, and Declaration against the foresaid Act of *Parliament* and Committee of *Estates* and all Oaths and Bonds in the Common Cause, imposed without Consent of the *Kirk*.

In pursuance of this, July last, The *Assembly* emits a Declaration, concerning the present Dangers of Religion, and especially the Sinfulness of that Engagement in War to relieve the King, as being a notorious Breach of the Covenant, in all the six Articles of it, on which they insist at large, and charge all that they be noways accessory to it, as they would eschew the wrath of GOD; and escape the Censures of the *Kirk*.

Upon this Declaration of the *Gen. Ass.* the Committee of *Estates* of *Parl.* were necessitate to write some Observations, wherein they prove demonstratively, that it was their bounden Duty, Commanded by GOD to assist and deliver their King out of Captivity; but the *Assembly* obstinately insists, and sends two Papers more to the Committee to disswade them, and at last August 2d. Sess. 25. they stoop to supplicate the Committee to forbear that undertaking, as being a snare to Men's Consciences to involve them in guiltiness, and to withdraw them from their former Principles and Vows in the Solemn League, &c. And because they were not like to prevail this way, they were so impudent as to draw a Supplication to the King himself to this purpose, August 12. 1648. a paper to their King, Prisoner by their means, so uncharitable and odious, that I think it may fill the Soul of every Good Man that Reads it, not only with grief and sorrow, but horror and amazement. In short, they tell him, That in all that had befallen him, it would be his Wisdom to Read the Righteous

eous hand of the LORD, writing bitter Things against him, as for all his provocations, so especially for resisting his work of the Covenant, and shedding the Blood of his People, for which it was high time to Repent, &c. Then they Adjure him, as he would not draw more guilt upon him, not to own or have a hand in this Engagement. Next they tell him, if he had hearkned to their Counsels ament the League and Covenant, he might been sitting in Peace in his own House. Where they manifestly take guilt to themselves, and not obscurely acknowledge that the Covenant and Oath into which they had entered against the Kings consent and Conscience too, was the cause of his present trouble and distress. And then they add, if he will yet hearken, he may be yet restored; but they are afraid their Counsels now will be in vain and without success, because of the wrath of the LORD of Hosts, who brings down the Mighty from his Throne, &c. but we shall mourn in secret for it. And what dismal insinuation is couched under this?

In the mean time their Commissioners at London, in imitation of and Obedience to their Constituents at Edinburgh, protested against the Deliverance of the King, and the Restoring him to the Exercise of his Regal Power, as being a Breach of the Solemn League in all its Articles, and so kept him fast in the hands of the Bloodthirsty Sectaries, from whom no Mercy was to be expected, as themselves had predicted in their Papers to his Majesty. And so far did the devil prevail with these Irreligious Miscreants, that they made the place of his Royaltie the Seat of his Execution, they conducted him through his great Room of State to that bloody Theatre of Inhumanity, and murdered him on a Scaffold before the Gates of his own Royal Palace, upon the 30 of January 1649.

The same year the Assembly being met at Edinburgh five Months after the Murder of the King, on the 20 of July, make an Act, That the Engagers in the War for relieving the King, make publick satisfaction in Sackcloth, or be Excommunicated, ordaining such as submitted to their Censure, to subscribe a Declaration of the unlawfulness of that Engagement, of their sorrow for their sin and guilt by their Accession to it, promising solemnly never to own the like Courses again. And July 27 1649. In the beginning of that Act, which they call a Seasonable and necessary Warning, &c. They call the defeat of the Army, that went into England, with design to bring the King to a Condition of Honour, Freedom and Safety, a Mercy and Deliverance, which ought to be remembered with Thankfulness and Praise. And withal they regret that the Malignants are not sufficiently broken, that King CH, the Second owns their Principles and Ways, that their Brethren

Brethren in *England* are like to prove treacherous to them, but no *Regret* for the *King's Murder*.

In the year 50. The Commission of the Gen *Ass.* at the *West-Kirk* 13 *August*, 1650. plainly own, that for 12 years before, they had been fighting against the *King*. Their words are these, *Therefore they declare, that this Kirk do not own nor Espouse any Malignant Party, or Quatrel or Interest, but that they fight meervly upon their former Grounds and Principles, and in Defence of the Cause of GOD and of the Kingdom, as they have done these 12 years past.*

Thus you have a long Train of hostile Proceedings against that now *Glorious Martyr King Charles 1st.* carried on Deliberately, Zealously, and Obstinately to the day of his Death, and can these Men be *Innocent*? And since they committed these things in pursuance of their Solemn League, and for the Establishment of *Presbytrie*, is it not manifest that the *Kings Death* was the D *smal*, but Genuine Effect of that *Bloody Covenant*? Since they did Contemn the *Kings Authority*, Weakned and Defeated *His Power and Force*, by Fighting in Conjunction with *Rebels* in the other Kingdom against Him, delivered Him up, when they should have been a *Shelter* to Him, insisted peremptorly on their Unjust Demands, when He was in the Hands of His *Cruel Enemies*, Protested against His being Restored to His *Royal Honour and Dignity* until they were Satisfied, tho they knew He could not in Conscience grant their Desire: Will any Man say, They were not for all that *Accessory* to his Imprisonment and Death? Would a *Jurie* of Fifteen Honest Sworn Men bring them in not *Guilty*? Have I not Enumerated in the forgoing *Narrative* the *Principal Ways* whereby Men may be Guilty of other Mens Sins, and by which the *Presbyterians* were Partakers of the Guilt of those that actually imbrewed their Hands in His *Innocent Blood*, such as *Counsel*, *Consent*, *Assistance*, *Approbation*, *Encouragement*, *Instigation*, not *Resisting*, not *Punishing*, nor *Reproving*, nor *Forbiding* such *Outrages and Violences* against the *Father* of their *Countrey*; but insulting over Him, even when in the Depth of Misery; All which I have made Evident from their own Records: And now, if these Men were not *Partakers*, of the *Murder* of that most *Excellent King*; I am bold to say, with the Greatest Reason imaginable, There was never one *Accessory* to another Man's Crime, since the time Man lived upon the Face of the Earth.

Plain Dealing Page Ult. I proved, it was consistent with Her *Majesties* Gracious Promises to the *Presbyterians*, to grant a *Toleration* to Us, as it was with the Royal Promises of *King Ch. 2d.* and *King James 7th.* made to the *Prelatists*, to grant *Indulgence and Toleration* to the *Presbyterians*, which no Man ever judged a Breach of their Royal Word. And therefore the *Presbyterians*, by opposing the grant of a Favour so Just and Reasonable, did plainly prefer the gratifying their own Humour to the Satisfaction and Pleasure of the *Queen*. The *Vindicator*, p. 34. plainly enough acknowledges he has been a little homely in his Letter in *Re-*
lation

lation to Her Majesty, saying, *That if it were not a Matter of Conscience, he had not so spoke.* But what if it be found, and I believe neither he, nor his Brethren doubt it, that it is as much and more Matter of Conscience with Her Majesty, to give a just Ease to all her Protestant Subjects of Her own Perswasion in the publick Exercise of their Religion and Worship, as it is with *Presbyterians* to withstand the Grant of it? Ought not then, in Good Manners, Her Majesty be first Gratiſied, and Her Religious Desire Satisfied; Especially when it can be done without any Force upon the Conſciences; I ſay, Not, The Humours of the *Presbyterians*, and without any Breach of Promise to Them, their Government being protected and maintained, and their Preachers ſecured in their Churches, and Benefices? No, not at all, that's a Satisfaction not to be granted; For, ſaith the *Vindicator*, it tendeth only for to create Jealouſies in the Hearts of Her Majesties Beſt Subjects, and thus he dwindles away their Conſciences into Jealouſies and Suſpicions. And the Queen is not to do a Pious and Religious Act, leaſt an Umbrage be given, and the *Presbyterian Preachers* and Bigots of their Party, Her Majesties beſt Friends, as every Body knows, be ſtartled and offended.

This Replyer hath Acted all along, not the Part of a *Vindicator*, but *Calumniator*, moſt virulently traducing and Reviling Us from the beginning of his Pamphlet unto the end thereof; His Tongue is an unruly Evil, it is full of deadly Poison. It might, perhaps have done the Man much harm, if he had kept in his venome, it was perfect Phyſick and health to him to belch it out; they have wrong'd us, and therefore are Brim-full of gall and ſpite againſt us, and no wonder that their mouths run over with the Poison of *Asps*: *naturale eſt odiſſe, quem laſeris*; Beſides, 'twas neceſſary to hold forth the ſtrength of his Arguments, as he tells us, p, 25. when he calls the Outed Curats ſuch a Company as would be a ſcandal to a Society of Heathens, and worſe then Popiſh Priests and Jeſuits: ſhould the *Vindicator* be blamed for making uſe of Calumny, that ſerves him for ſuch purpoſes? It has always been a moſt ſucceſſfull Topick, by which his Party heretofore has done conſiderable ſeats, and for him to abandon it, were at once to do violence to his Temper, and to betray his Cauſe: But tho that be nothing ſtrange, yet this is very aſtoniſhing, that whiſt he is throwing dirt into our Faces, he ſhould take the boldneſs to ſay, *He loves us*, p. 35. there he compares and equals us to the Popiſh Priests and Jeſuits, who excited the Papists to maſſacre the Proteſtants in Ireland. And in the very next Sentence he wheens out, *I declare, I bear no hatred to them, I love them, and look upon them as Chriſtians, (and is not that, think ye, very much,) and I am diſpoſed to perform all Chriſtian Duties towards them, I am far from venting Calumnies, &c.* for theſe he calls neceſſary Truths.

What prodigious Impudence is this? Can ſuch Poisonous ſtreams, as Lies, Reproaches, Defamations, Bitterneſs &c. Flow from the Sweet Fountain of Charity? 'tis as Impoſſible, as one and the ſame Fountain can, at the ſame place, ſend forth Sweet Water and Bitter, Salt Water and Freſh. *He Loves us!* So, I think, as the Ape Loves her Puppies, he kills with his Love, Murthers our Reputation among Men, they Publishing and Diſperſing their Infamous Lybels not only throw

this Kingdom, but that of England too. Nay, He Loves Us as *Thais* Loved *Phaedria*, *miseræ, præ amore, exclusit hinc Foras*. Terent. She poor *Soul*, for very Love did shut him out of Doors. Thus he, out of pure Love, would have us Excluded not only the Society of Christians, Jews, and Turks but of the very Heathens; we would be a Scandal to their Society, saith he, page 25, so that he would have us Exterminated from off the Earth. Since this is his Love, and the Christian Duties he is ready to perform, let him reserve them for his Dearer Friends: Tho' his Brother the 25th of July last, before the Honourable Estates of Parliament, charged Us with Capital Crimes, yet the old Distemper of his Skull may plead some Merciful allowance to his Impotent and Spleenish Malice; but this *Vindicator*, who pretends to be as yet in his Right Wits, is left without Excuse.

Sir, I now make an end of this Letter, for I am Extreemly weary with the Contentious Wrangling of this *Vindicator*, and will not any more undergo the Drudgery of Answering his Pitiful Exceptions, Calumnies, and Clamours; could he have brought any thing Material against my Paper, certainly, by Straining, it had been out e're now. A Man that is once Resolved to shut his Eyes against the Light, and not to yeild to the most Convincing Evidence, if he have any Subtlety of Spirit, will make a shift to say somewhat upon any thing, tho' it be but Irrational and Impertinent. Therefore I would Humbly Intreat, you would be pleased to Compare the *Gentleman's Letter* and *Vindication* thereof, with my *Plain Dealing* and this *Defence* of it, and then Judge which of Us two, in these Combats, maintains his Ground best, and whether upon the whole, a Toleration to Us of the *Episcopal Perswasion* be not highly Reasonable and necessary.

S I R,

I am in all due Respect

Your most Humble Servant:



E R R A T A

Page 7. line 23. after cannot add be. Ibid. l: 25. for this r: his. p: 21. l: 19. for whom r: when. p: 24. l: 23. for Probably r: Possibly. p: 25. l: 22. for Selkirk r: Askirk. Ibid: l: 24. r: Todshahaugh. p: 28. l: 35. r: Patella. p: 38. l: 30. for Protestants r: Protesters.

[illegible]